

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

FEBRUARY, 1928

THE LAW SCHOOL TOMORROW

BY ROBERT M. HUTCHINS

Dean of the Law School of Yale University

AMERICAN lawyers are selected through the operation of tests which for a democracy are rigorous in the extreme. It is a rare thing when in one of our large commercial jurisdictions half the candidates in any year are admitted to the bar. And all these candidates before being permitted to appear for the examinations are now subjected to most undemocratic treatment. Some of our important States require a prospective lawyer to have spent two years in college. The New York Court of Appeals has lately announced that this is the policy it will adopt. In many States, too, those who wish to become members of the bar must allow a committee to investigate the histories of their lives with a view to the discovery of unpleasant items in them which might unfit them to advise clients as to the ethics or legality of their conduct.

Reinforced, perhaps, by that desire for monopoly which animated the trade guilds of an earlier day, but chiefly from a sense of public spirit, lawyers have long demanded higher standards for admission to their profession. The American Bar Association and the various State associations are almost unanimous in alleging that more education must be required of the men to whom the task of guiding vast social and economic interests through the mazes of American statute and common law is to be entrusted. The law schools are leading in the outcry for better

Copyright, 1928, by North American Review Corporation. All rights reserved.

lawyers, some of them, perhaps, in the hope that if the requirements for the bar are made more severe by the State authorities, the schools may at length be able to advance their own.

And so we find both the practising and teaching branches of the profession very insistent that inferior men shall be kept away from the administration of justice. But when you ask a lawyer or a law teacher what he is proposing to do for the superior men whom he will allow to enter the law schools, he has very little to offer you. Certainly some men are so constituted either as to brains or background or both that they should never be allowed to get near a law school, much less a client. But assuming that you have a man who possesses a certain minimum of intelligence and honesty, so that you cannot be absolutely sure that he will be disbarred after he has been in practice six months, what kind of training will you give him? Nobody knows.

Nobody knows because nobody has been thinking about the problem. We have been so absorbed in trying to get rid of the inferior men that we have given very little attention to what we shall do for the good ones. Not that progress has not been made. In the good old days a few kindly and elderly gentlemen would take the sons of other similar gentlemen into their offices and have them read textbooks and cases until they acquired a genteel familiarity with the vocabulary with which members of our profession habitually conceal their secrets from the layman. That system has now almost wholly disappeared, and where it still exists in the modified form of permitting men to qualify as lawyers after a certain period as clerks, it is frowned upon by the guardians of the bar.

As the next step, the elderly gentlemen simply ousted the students from their offices and grouped them in another place where they would not be always under foot, and in this way founded law schools. These schools or their prototypes are still in existence, and have more students on their rolls than any other kind. The atmosphere has changed a good deal in some of them. Instead of the veterans of the bar, the well known eminent counsel of the old days, we are now likely to have in charge energetic business men who are using the school chiefly as a means of increasing their revenues. Legal education is one of the few

branches of education that can be made to pay and still be kept respectable. None of the elaborate apparatus of the medical school, for instance, is required. Not even a library is an essential; some schools which have satisfactory reputations continue to retain them in spite of the fact that they have no libraries of their own; they use the Court House collection. Many such institutions seek to increase their profits by running day and night: the more men, the more money.

No one wishes, I suppose, to keep out of the legal profession men who deserve to be in it. But it can no longer be seriously argued that this means every man who wants to be in it. The night schools allege that they look after the man who has not financial resources adequate to the job of three years of law school. But this argument applies with almost as much force to any educational requirement for the bar; and there are too many lawyers anyway, so that it may be better to keep out a few exceptional individuals than to give a factory training to an enormous number who admittedly are not exceptional. For there can be little doubt that a factory training is what the night schools give. The object is to teach the student enough to pass the bar examinations. This is done by making him memorize the salient rules in his own jurisdiction. A teacher is judged by his ability to put these rules across so that a high school student can remember them long enough to write them down on the examination. To the purpose of the rules, their function in society, and the function of those who are to participate in administering them, little or no attention is given. The students do not pay for that.

Those of us who are employed by institutions which profess higher ideals have seldom stopped to scrutinize those ideals to determine whether they are in fact higher. The schools which consider themselves the best require a college degree, on the theory that maturity and "background" are essential to the study of the law. Whether the maturity which is represented by age twenty-two and the background which is represented by four years of strenuous attention to extra-curriculum activities are necessary to the study of the law, has never been carefully studied. The syllogism has run: Inferior schools require little or no college training; we require a great deal of college training;

therefore we are not an inferior school. A parallel syllogism is: Inferior schools are staffed chiefly by practicing lawyers who give only part of their time to teaching; all our staff are full-time teachers; therefore we are not an inferior school. Unfortunately the problem is not quite as simple as that. Waiving the question of maturity, what is the best background for the study of the law?

Today there are two schools of thought, or rather two schools of guess. One group, observing that legal problems run into problems in the social sciences, assert that a prospective law student should spend most of his time in college on the social sciences. The other, observing that engineering is at the basis of modern civilization, that some of the social sciences are poorly taught and badly organized, and that a lawyer needs to be careful and accurate, assert that a man thoroughly trained in the physical sciences will make the best lawyer. Discussions between these two groups usually lead to the conclusion reached by the most exclusive body in the law school world, the Association of American Law Schools, namely, that no conclusion is possible. The unsatisfactory nature of this result at a time when legal education is being assailed from without and within leads us to look hopefully for the outcome of the study undertaken this year by the faculty of the Columbia Law School, the first important attempt to arrive at an answer to the question on grounds of educational soundness rather than administrative convenience. Although the results are not yet known, the energy and acumen with which the problem has been attacked make it the most promising venture now under way in this branch of legal education.

The indifference of the better law schools to the previous training of their students has led to mass production of law school graduates. There are now so many colleges that if you admit anybody who has an A.B. degree, you are certain to have too many men. Here once more the difference between the inferior schools and those which call themselves superior becomes shadowy. The inferior school admits great quantities of students, and can successfully do so because if one's sole object is to cram men for examinations, one can probably cram them as well in large numbers as in small. The superior school admits great

quantities, without realizing that their number may be an important element in determining the superiority of a school.

All the best law schools employ the case method of instruction introduced by Langdell at Harvard in 1875. Before that time law courses were conducted as most college courses are conducted today. The student read and memorized passages from important textbooks and discussed them with his instructor. In the belief that students whose chief material in practice would be the decisions of courts of last resort should familiarize themselves as soon as possible with those decisions, Langdell placed in the hands of his men selected cases and centered the class room discussion around them. The point is that under the case system there is discussion. The opinions of the judges are subjected to the most careful scrutiny; all the members of the class are supposed to enter eagerly into arguments as to the facts and the law and the practical results of the decisions. In theory this is a great advance over the earlier method of instruction. Instead of merely learning by heart the dicta of textbook writers, all the class analyze together actual opinions which represent the living law. In practice, however, under modern conditions the advance is not so great as might at first appear. In a class of twenty-five the method is admirable. It is good with a class of fifty. It may perhaps work with a class of seventy-five. But at one hundred or somewhat beyond it the period of diminishing returns sets in. In classes of three or four hundred only a few can participate in the discussion, for the obvious reason that they cannot hear or be heard. The result is that in groups of these dimensions the instruction given in the best schools is likely to approximate that given in the worst.

The truth is that the case system was so significant an improvement over the method which it supplanted that it has been regarded as the last word in legal education. It seems incredible, but it is fair to say that the best schools have made no important contribution to legal education except the case system and full-time instruction in fifty years. These schools seem to have supposed that if you admitted college graduates only and had professional teachers employing the case method exclusively, you *ipso facto* achieved perfection.

But it is by no means clear, as we have already noticed, that all college graduates should study law, or that those who study it should study it the same way. Even if the numbers in a law school are limited (and no serious attempt at limitation has been in force long enough to predict what its effect will be), there are still difficulties in the use of the case system which suggest that modifications in it may be worth while. In a class of one hundred men ten are probably very good and ten rather poor. Fifteen are likely to be not quite so good, and fifteen not quite so poor. The other fifty will be average. Assuming that the class is not too *large* for ideal discussions, it is too *uneven* for discussions even approaching the ideal. A pace that is fast enough to hold the interest of the best men is far too fast for all the rest. A pace slow enough for the poorest men is far too slow for all the rest. Usually, therefore, the instructor compromises on a pace that is fast enough for the fifty in the middle, a pace too slow for the best and too fast for the poorest.

Almost all the privately endowed colleges in the East have attempted to meet this difficulty in collegiate education by instituting honors courses in which the best men work independently or in small groups on problems that are of special interest to them. They labor free from the routine of the classroom and the retarding effect of their less able or less energetic contemporaries. Such courses are unheard of in the law (except in one or two schools which have just begun to experiment with them) in spite of the fact that the law is admirably adapted to this type of study. After a man has been a year in law school and has reached the top of his class, there is no compelling reason why he should work *en masse* thereafter. He has learned the technique of reading and analyzing the opinions of judges, and does not need two years more of the same thing. What he needs now is to be turned loose to learn to think for himself. Through four years of college his powers of independent effort have lain dormant. If they lie dormant for another three, he may later, when he needs to use them in the struggle for existence, be unable to awaken them. Through four years of college, too, the student has been exposed to countless subjects and has mastered none. It would seem that the time for mastery of something comes in the professional

school and that to continue the process of exposure is to lose the best opportunity that comes to American educators to give a real education.

There is only one valid objection to honors courses in the law. They are expensive. It is probably correct to say that six honors men will take as much of an instructor's time as a class of two or three hundred taught on the conventional plan. But this objection merely brings us back to the unimportance of numbers in legal education. Which is better, to give two or three hundred men a mediocre training or to give six their first experience of hard work, independent thinking, and intimate relationship with their teachers? Nobody has complained that there are too few lawyers. The complaint has been that there are too many poor ones. The first-class law schools may well assert that they are under no obligation to increase the number of inadequately prepared members; their task is to prepare leaders for the bar.

We have not solved the problem of how best to train leaders of the bar merely by saying we shall admit college graduates only and shall have full-time men teach them solely by the case method. Whether or not there is some more effective if less automatic mode of selecting students, and also of instructing students once they are admitted, are subjects which require more study and thought than have yet been given to them.

There is more to be done especially in determining the subject matter of the law school curriculum. If you are simply trying to get your men past the bar examinations, the answer is easy enough. All you have to do is to coach them as intensively as possible on the rules of law which the examiners are certain to inquire about. If, however, you wish to make your graduates useful members of society, or what may not always be the same thing, able advisers of their clients, the problem becomes more difficult. As I have suggested, in large classes under the case method the best schools are practically teaching their students to memorize rules of law as found in the opinions of appellate courts. But the main duty of a lawyer is to predict intelligently what governmental officers are likely to do in a certain situation. This of course involves a knowledge of what other governmental officers have done in similar situations, because such people are

notoriously conservative. Where one case is identical with another the investigation may end at this point. The matter may be too well settled to make further controversy worth while. Then all that is necessary is knowledge of the rule. But where the facts are different, so that there is no compelling logical reason for following the earlier decision, the court must consciously or unconsciously reach its conclusion according to the results which may be expected to flow from its enunciation of the law.

To take a simple case, it is said that no State may "burden foreign commerce." Suppose a State passes a law regulating, through license fees and otherwise, agents in the State who receive money on deposit from immigrants also in the State who wish to accumulate enough to have their families come over to join them, and who when enough has been accumulated buy tickets for their families from the agents. First, are the agents engaged in foreign commerce? Second, are the local regulations a "burden"? The framers of our Constitution could hardly have foreseen this problem; little help is to be derived from a perusal of the document or the debates on it. There is no case exactly in point. How shall the lawyer advise his client? He will of course have to know the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States defining foreign commerce and burdens upon it. Even then he will not be far advanced unless he has had some training in scientific method, and knows enough to know that meaning is conferred on words for a purpose and that the same person does not always mean the same thing when he uses the same word.

C. K. Ogden, co-author with I. A. Richards of that important book *The Meaning of Meaning*, has lately called attention to the interpretation of the word "inflict" in a recent decision of one of our supreme courts. The court held in determining the meaning of the word as used in an insurance policy that it excludes the actions of insane persons. The insane cannot "act" in the eyes of the law, and anyone who "inflicts" an injury "acts". They cannot act because they "do not have a purpose in mind. Their mind is gone." As Mr. Ogden suggests, "At every turn lawyers, judges, and legislators, entirely untrained in the analysis of 'meaning,' are today confronted by similar intri-

cate problems of the interpretation of words with which they are quite incompetent to deal." The American Law Institute is probably the most imposing body of legal lights in the world. But that group has adopted the statements of an eminent legal scholar now engaged in re-stating an important branch of the law to the effect that one is a "slave" if he is a slave at home, even though in the particular jurisdiction into which he has journeyed the master can exert none of the powers of mastery. Similarly, one is "married" if his marriage was valid where it took place, even though in the jurisdiction where he is living he can be put in jail for adultery. His marriage is "valid," but "unenforceable." This kind of playing with words is too common in the law; and special training is required to cope with it. When it comes to dealing with the definitions of constitutional terms, the best prepared lawyer is the one who has had such training.

The well-prepared lawyer in our case of the immigrant ticket agent will also have to know enough about the make-up of the court to have some idea of its probable reaction to immigrants, people engaged in making money by dealing with them, State regulation of business, and judicial interference with it. But what should be his heaviest guns may not be strictly legal artillery at all, artillery not to be found in the casebooks he has studied. It may be evidence of the social or economic need for such legislation, and the social and economic results which are likely to follow if it is declared unconstitutional. That is, if a court is not forced by what seem the plain words of statute or prior decision to reach a certain result, it is likely to reach it or not reach it according to the practical effect of the decision upon what are assumed to be the paramount interests of the community.

In the best law schools today this is well understood. But it is supposed that every law teacher knows exactly what the practical effect of certain decisions will be simply because he has read a great many cases. In the classroom he and his students will criticize the opinions of the courts as "socially undesirable". Certainly a law teacher can guess as to what is socially undesirable; but unless he is in touch with modern developments in the social sciences he can hardly make an intelligent guess. The

Federal Trade Commission has lately ordered a motion picture organization to cease and desist from its practice of compelling theatre owners who deal with it to take a large block of pictures including some poor ones in order to get any good ones. How many law school professors know enough about industry in general and the motion picture industry in particular to make a fair appraisal of the practice and the desirability of its cessation? Yet when the courts have finally disposed of the question, law school men all over the country will point out the rights and wrongs of the decision with hardly a bow to the great unknown.

Of course, it may be said first that the discovery of the rules of law is difficult enough and that the law school teacher can hardly be expected to know thoroughly the entire field of the social sciences. It may be argued, too, that the techniques of the various social sciences are so undeveloped that a lawyer's guess is as good as anybody else's. The reply to the first objection is that we do not need to know thoroughly the entire field. We do need to know what is going on in it and whom to resort to for assistance. In criminal law, psychiatry, psychology, and sociology have contributions to make to us that are so important as to be justly regarded as fundamental. But the number of universities in which the law teachers and the scholars in these subjects have even the slightest informal contact is negligible. In Banking Law the problem of the economist and the lawyer is likely to be one. In a leading university of the East the teacher of Banking in the department of Economics and the teacher of Banking Law in the law school worked in different buildings on the same campus for two years without ever seeing each other. The questions which confront the student of Labor Law are being studied by the students in graduate schools and colleges under the title of Trade Unionism or Labor Problems. When the Supreme Court decides that the reserve of a mutual insurance company is not taxable, it is, it is true, deciding a legal question, but a legal question so bound up by economic and social questions that to discuss one aspect of the matter without reference to the others is impossible. When the Supreme Court of South Carolina holds that a man who says, "I don't believe I'm going to make it," and shortly dies, was not in the fear of imminent death so as to

make his accusations of the defendant admissible against the defendant on his trial for murdering the declarant, it is deciding a question in the law of Evidence. But no conclusion as to the "soundness" of the decision can be reached without resort to the psychologists.

Indeed, the notion of "the law" as something which may be discovered, seized upon, and learned; something concrete, fixed, and immutable, has retarded the progress of legal education in more ways than one. Even in the best law schools the law is presented as a series of concepts. In the course called Agency, for instance, you are likely to begin with the "nature" of agency. You will have a case where the husband has left his wife without means of support. The court may say that the wife may pledge the husband's credit because she is his "agent by necessity". The next case may be one where the clerk in a State office sues for his salary. A statute provides that all salaries of public officers and "agents" must be fixed by the legislature, and none has been fixed for the plaintiff's position. The court holds that the plaintiff is a "servant" and not an "agent". The next opinion submitted to the inquiring student will discuss whether a carpenter employed to repair a hotel is an "agent" of the hotel owner so that the latter becomes liable for damage done by the collapse of the carpenter's scaffold.

From these cases and others in which the word "agency" appears, the seeker after truth is supposed to deduce what an "agency" is, and to carry in his mind ever after a definite concept bearing that name. It is useful to know what the courts call an agency in arguing cases where that term may be involved; but how much more useful would a legal education be if the emphasis were placed on the *situation* in which the client finds himself instead of on the verbiage which is used to describe it. The poor unfortunate who is compelled to visit a lawyer's office has a story to tell. He will be seeking advice as to the best course for him to follow on these facts. The facts are therefore of the first importance. Consequently law school courses organized according to the types of situations presented would seem to prepare a lawyer best to advise a client who is in a certain situation. Thus our case concerning what a wife may do to secure necessities

when her husband deserts her would be taught as one of the situations which arise in connection with the family, and incorporated, if it arises frequently enough, in a course in Family Law. The decision dealing with the difficulties of a government clerk in securing his salary would be presented with other cases as to government officers, perhaps in a course in Administrative Law. The opinion involving what you can do when someone else carelessly drops a scaffolding on your head would be aligned with other cases of similar situations. The concepts and language of the courts would not be overlooked; but the emphasis would be placed on the facts.

Experiments with courses looking in this direction are now in progress in one or two leading law schools. The results have been so satisfactory that other courses of the same kind are in process of organization. Whether in the long run this brand of instruction will give us better lawyers remains to be seen. The encouraging thing is that experimentation is going on. The scientific mind is essentially the experimental mind. The legal mind appears to be opposed to experiment. The conservatism of our profession is proverbial. The possible lines of development in legal education which I have tentatively sketched here are an old story in medical education. The leading medical schools do not accept men merely because they have college degrees. One school of medicine with an endowment of over \$5,000,000 has limited its enrollment to 200 students. In medicine the State examinations are an incident, not an objective. The "functional approach" to the study of the subject which is regarded with the utmost suspicion in the law is orthodox in medicine. There is more thought applied to medical education in one year than to legal education in ten. When we have made an improvement we spend an indefinite period congratulating ourselves upon it, instead of studying how to make still further improvements. And yet, with the country demanding a more efficient administration of justice; with the lawyers, the judges, and the teachers agreeing that something is wrong, it is plain that still further improvements must be made. It will not be enough to exclude the worst men from the study of the law. We must find out how to make the most of the best.

FRANK O. LOWDEN

BY WILLIAM H. CRAWFORD

IN discussing Frank O. Lowden as a Presidential possibility, three points are important: First, his fitness for the job; second, the probability of his nomination; and third, the probability of his election should he be nominated.

I will first discuss the probability of his nomination, for the delegates to the Republican National Convention will be influenced by the other two in picking the party nominee. They will try to select the man best fitted for the job, who has the best chance of being elected if nominated.

I

The Republican party since its beginning has, in reality, been two parties, holding widely divergent economic views. Its phenomenal success in the past has depended upon a working agreement between the industrial and capitalistic East and the agricultural West. This combination is necessary to success, at the polls. The electoral vote of the past demonstrates that no Republican has been elected without the support of both wings of the party. It will therefore be wise, and it is reasonable to surmise that the Republican National Convention will try, to select a man who can hold the support of both the East and the West.

The industrial East and the agricultural West have been strange political bedfellows. It is remarkable that they have held together so long, since they had so few political tenets in common and their interests were so dissimilar. The Republican party has always been the party of Protection. The East needs Protection; quite naturally, therefore, it is satisfied with the compact which kept the high tariff party in power. The West has had no Protection. Not only has the tariff not furnished Protection to the West, but it has increased the cost of the farmer's supplies.

He pays more for his clothing, shoes, plows and farm implements, in order to permit the Eastern manufacturers to make a legitimate profit on all their goods and, at the same time, meet foreign competition.

The West became Republican as a patriotic duty. It was the party of Lincoln, and it is slow to change its politics. The Western farmer has also continued to support the Republican party because he believed "a Republican Administration brings good times," and "good times" means a higher price for his produce. Both of these ties are becoming less potent. The automobile, good roads and the radio have brought the farmer in closer contact with the world. They have materially broadened his viewpoint. The World War has united the people of the United States. There is no North, no South, no East and no West. Therefore the sentimental tie which made him Republican is waning. If he continues true to that party, it will be solely because he believes it is to his interest to do so.

Naturally, the farmer is beginning to doubt that Republican rule, as administered in the past, brings "good times" to him. It is almost impossible to convince him that he is prosperous when mortgages are being foreclosed on his farm. He has become dissatisfied with the unequal partnership in which his Eastern partner has derived all the profits. He reasons in this manner: "Eastern industry has had tariff protection for its manufactures. Finance has had the protection of the Federal Reserve Board. The railroads, largely owned in the East, have direct support from the Government; while all we have to show for our partnership is the permission to wave the patriotic flag and a fast waning hope that Republican rule will bring us prosperity, as a by-product".

The rumbling of discontent began with Roosevelt's Bull Moose organization. It has continued to increase in volume until the farmers are about ready to issue an ultimatum to their erstwhile partner. The ultimatum is: "We demand a share of the protection which the Government furnishes to those in other lines of industry." The Republican party thus faces a crisis. Without the support of the West it is doomed to defeat in the next election. It will lose this support unless it guarantees much more to the farmer than lip service. The West is tired of "pulling the chest-

nuts out of the fire". It will demand that the candidate selected this year be in sympathy with agricultural needs.

Money is very timorous. Compared with it, the fawn is lion-hearted. The capitalists in the East fear anything tinged with Radicalism. At the least sign of a Radical coming into power, they flee to cover. Capital controls the Republican party in the East. There is no possibility of the industrial East accepting an ultra progressive as the Republican nominee. It will refuse to support a Farm Labor candidate, either at the Republican National Convention or as the nominee of the Republican party at the general elections.

The East can muster sufficient strength in the next Republican National Convention to prevent the nomination of a man whose record indicates that he opposes capital and industry. The West can muster enough strength to prevent the nomination of an ultra conservative. It will be exceedingly difficult for a typical representative of either wing of the party to secure the nomination, and still more difficult, should the convention nominate such a man, for him to win in the general election.

This apparently brings us to an impasse. It seemingly leads to a dissolving of the partnership of the firm composing the Republican party. There is, however, a solution to the question. It is in the selection of a man whom both the East and the West will support.

II

Frank O. Lowden is that man, because he knows, understands, sympathizes with and is affiliated with both branches of the party. He is a favorite of the West because his record shows him to be its friend. The East does not dislike or fear him and, more important still, would support him loyally, were he the Republican nominee. A retrospect of his life will show why he eminently fits as the connecting link between these two extremes of the party.

Mr. Lowden is popular with the agricultural West, because he is a farmer and understands farmers' needs. His understanding is not theoretical; is not a belated sympathy with the farmer, for political purposes. He was raised on a farm. He was born at Sunrise, Minn., at that time a crossroads where a country store

and a postoffice were located. His father owned a small farm and eked out his meager income by doing wheelwrighting and blacksmithing for his neighbors.

As soon as he was able to toddle about the farm, the boy did the chores of a farmer's son. He attended to the chickens, and helped feed the hogs and hoe the potatoes. His earliest memory concerns farm work. When he was in his early teens, his father moved to Columbia County, Iowa, the trip being made in the old fashioned covered wagon, with Frank, as a barefooted boy, trudging on behind.

Early in life, young Frank determined to get an education. The elder Lowden had no money to educate his boy. Nothing daunted, the son determined to educate himself. When sixteen years old, he began teaching a country school. Living cost him nothing, for he boarded around with his pupils and saved all of his meager salary to get enough money to attend college. He expected, at that time, to be a farmer, so he chose the Iowa State College at Ames in which to matriculate. He had only enough cash to pay his way for one term, but, with true grit, he entered college determined to finance himself as he went along. "Tom" Burke, a classmate, says that "Frank was the greenest country farm boy that he ever saw" when he entered college.

During his first year at Ames, he determined to become a lawyer, and felt that an academic education would better fit him for this work than a course in the agricultural school. So, the following year, he transferred to the State University. He lived economically, worked steadily—teaching school during the Summer, acting as agent for a newspaper and a laundry—and studied diligently. During his last year he confided to an official visitor his legal aspirations. The gentleman gave him a note to a prominent law firm in the Western metropolis, advising him that he would greatly improve his chance of getting the position if he understood shorthand; so, during the last six months of his college career, he took on this extra study. Despite these multitudinous tasks, he was graduated at the State University as first honor man and with a few dollars more in his pocket than he had when he entered.

The gentleman's note of recommendation secured the position

for him and the following year he entered the Union Law School, of Chicago, taking the night course. The legal firm found that young Lowden possessed a brilliant mind and a natural adaptability for the law. It was not long before he had deserted his stenographic desk and was acting as a law clerk for the firm, and before his graduation was handling many of their minor cases.

After becoming a full fledged attorney he continued in the firm's employ for two years in order to secure enough money to open an office for himself. Then he set out on his own responsibility. His experience in legal matters, and the worth while friends he had made, gave him a substantial background. However, the first year is always a hard time for a young lawyer. He made a living from the beginning, but that was about all.

About this time he met Miss Florence Pullman. It was a case of love at first sight and the attraction was mutual. When Mr. Lowden asked her father for her hand, Mr. Pullman cautiously inquired: "Young man, how much money are you making?" Mr. Lowden mentioned his modest income, to which Mr. Pullman replied: "Why, that is not enough to buy violets for Florence!" Mr. Lowden rejoined: "Then Florence will do without violets, for she will have to live on my income."

His independence pleased Mr. Pullman and won his consent. To Frank Lowden's credit be it said that he has religiously adhered to the promise made Mr. Pullman. The Lowden family have lived on the income earned by him. He has never accepted any of the Pullman fortune for the use either of himself or his family. After they were married, they went to live in a modest home in Chicago. Mrs. Lowden did not have to forego entirely her much beloved violets, for her husband rose quickly, and was soon recognized as one of the ablest trial lawyers of the Chicago bar.

Among his clients were some of the largest firms in Chicago. Two cases altered the course of his career. One of his clients was a baking concern. Just at this time there was an industrial war among the bakers in Chicago, with the result that all of them were losing money. His client was on the verge of bankruptcy. In order to save something from the wreck, he turned his affairs over to the young attorney, who put in some of his own money to

refinance the concern. The result was the National Biscuit Company. The other client was the American Radiator Company, which was just beginning its career. Lowden had made such a reputation as a shrewd business man that they called him in to reorganize their company. Everyone who has enjoyed the comforts of steam heat knows how successful his efforts were.

Success came to him early. By the time he was forty years old he retired to his first love, the country. He purchased a farm at Oregon, Illinois, about one hundred miles from Chicago. His farm was not a plaything. He put the same amount of energy and enterprise into making his farm pay that he had done in his business. He installed modern machinery, purchased the best breed of cattle, and adopted scientific farming methods. There are no farms in America more carefully and industriously tilled than those of Frank Lowden. He supervises his home farm, himself, and is up at the break of day and in his saddle until dusk. Not content with running Sinissippi Farm, he has purchased large acreage in many of the Western and Southern States. Probably he has more acres in direct cultivation than any other farmer in America. He has spent two-thirds of his life on the farm. During the formative period he was a farmer's boy; during his active career he was a successful lawyer, and the last twenty-five years he has been an intelligent and active agriculturist.

III

The farmers love Lowden because he is one of them. He is not only a farmer, himself, but has spent largely of his money and time in an effort to improve farming conditions. He has throughout his career invariably supported, in Congress and the legislatures of the States in which he is interested agriculturally, all measures looking to the betterment of farming conditions. His support of the farmer has not been lip service.

The farmers know that Frank Lowden is not only a friend of theirs but one of them. Naturally he is their choice for the Presidency; naturally he can pull a larger agricultural vote than any other Republican candidate. Many Democrats would vote for Frank Lowden.

Now let us look at the other side of the picture.

The industrial East has no reason to be afraid of him. It will loyally support him when his true character is known. Frank Lowden was a level headed business man before he became a farmer. He is sufficiently level headed to have accumulated a considerable fortune, entirely through his own efforts. He is sufficiently level headed to have put two immense businesses on a solid foundation. He knows the needs and necessities of capital. He has too much at stake to do anything that would cripple business, were he elected to the Presidency. He understands the protection which it must have to prosper. He realizes the importance of business confidence. His record as Congressman and as Governor shows that he is a constructive rather than a destructive statesman. The introduction of the Budget system, in the handling of the State's business, and the scientific building of good roads, both of which have been adopted by many States, are examples of his constructive work.

The objection voiced against Mr. Lowden is that he supports the McNary-Haugen Bill. The prominent opponents of that measure said, in unison: "This bill is not economically sound. It means that the Government is pensioning the farmer. Lowden, as its supporter, must also be a Radical." Slogans have a way of striking the public fancy. Without stopping to investigate the matter, many people have accepted, as true, these statements. Such attitude frequently leads to wrong conclusions. It does not necessarily follow that an economic measure is unsound because reactionary statesmen do not immediately support it.

The Parcels Post was labelled as a Socialistic measure, by them; but it has been a national benefit. The Federal Reserve Bank, which was bitterly opposed, is now a tower of strength in the financial world. Any legislative innovation is immediately labelled by the reactionary, who prefers no changes.

Further, the McNary-Haugen Bill is not a creature of Frank Lowden's brain. It is not the acme of perfection in farm relief legislation. He thinks, however, that it is a step in the right direction. He would have approved it, had he been President, but should scientific economic research demonstrate improvements in the bill, he would be the first to back them.

His attitude on farm relief is:

1—The farmers must have relief. They are not making a living, as is evidenced by constant foreclosures of farm mortgages, throughout the country.

2—Our supposed prosperity is more or less fictitious and cannot be permanent with such a large section of our country in an unsound economic condition.

3—Some method must be devised to protect the farmer and make him self supporting. It is not only the duty, but to the interest of the Government, to furnish this protection.

When the East understands what farm relief means; when it knows that the relief is in the form of a loan, rather than a gift, to the farmers; when it realizes that this loan, which is of short duration, will be paid back with interest; and when it realizes that the man who makes these promises is too broad visioned a statesman and too keen a business man to approve of any measure that means a financial loss to the Government, the opposition to him in the East will disappear.

Frank O. Lowden can poll a larger vote for the Republican party than any other candidate, because he is the one man on whom the divergent wings of the Republican party can unite.

THE MAN FROM MONTANA

BY CHARLES MICHELSON

SENATOR Thomas James Walsh has been called the "alibi candidate" for the Democratic Presidential nomination. Because of him the South and West are able to deny that it is religious intolerance that makes them fight against Governor Smith and to place their hostility on the ground of Smith's wetness and Tammanyism. He is as good a Catholic as the man who made the brown derby famous, but there never was a time when Dixieland and the Corn Belt have not indicated more or less willingness to accept him as a welcome alternative. Even the Klan shakes no nightshirts at Walsh, perhaps because he has not yet approached near enough a nomination to be deemed dangerous. It may be that this immunity will not continue if, out of another Democratic deadlock, there issues the really impressive figure of the Montana Senator, somewhere near the head of the list, but until that time comes there is no voice raised against Walsh in all the army that regards the defeat of Smith as the first duty of every hundred percenter.

All the important individuals among the pre-convention aspirants this year grade up pretty well in ability, experience, culture and reputation, which are the usual concomitants of eligibility. Availability is another thing, and from Western viewpoints, at least, Walsh has all the high marks. He is always spoken of, politically, in comparison with Smith. His supporters are prone to use the latter as a measuring stick in surveying their candidate. For example:

"Smith is a great Governor—well, Walsh is a great Senator; and that for as many terms and those terms three times as long as the New York Executive's.

"Smith was a poor boy who raised himself by sheer ability to eminence. Walsh was just as poor, and taught himself and then taught school while he was learning law, and so progressed until

he became the leading constitutional lawyer in Congress. He has traveled widely; his membership in all the big Senate committees has given him the broadest insight into the affairs of government, domestic and foreign.

"Smith can carry New York. Walsh can carry the West, which is bigger than New York.

"Smith has established a standard of honesty in State Government; Walsh has chased two Cabinet officers out of the National Government and has made graft as unfashionable as a kleagle in a synagogue.

"Smith represents the national revolt against the Volstead act; Walsh represents the spirit of law observance. If Prohibition is not a party issue, why should New York not vote for him as a candidate? If it is such an issue, it should not be lost sight of that there are ten dry States for every wet one."

It is not difficult to make out a plausible case for the Walsh candidacy. Except geographically, he measures up to all the standards of the Presidency. One of the appealing things about him is that he drinks as he votes; that is he is personally as well as politically dry. It is doubtful if that can be said of half a dozen in the whole Senate. It cannot be easy for him, for he is a sociable soul; something of an afternoon tea hound. To his further credit be it recorded that he confines his championing of the Prohibition cause to business hours. Take him where the cocktails are waving and the balls are high, as his gregarious instinct frequently does, and he enjoys them—vicariously, of course—and does not talk about it afterwards. Recently his State went wet on a referendum, but he did not change with it. He prefers to regard the incident as a Commonwealth aberration from which Montana will recover, and meanwhile he continues to take the dry side of Senate debates and confines himself to ginger ale on the Nineteenth Hole when he plays golf—which he does painstakingly, if indifferently.

It is the plaint of the Smith people that the Democratic South refuses to consent to the nomination of their man, while it will vote for him if the nomination is forced on them. The Walsh people have as good an argument. If New York and New England would help nominate the Montanian, and would vote

for him in the election, Walsh would be elected. Their calculations run this way: Walsh would sweep the West, and would carry the South and, with him as the candidate,—with the possible exception of Maryland, wedded to its wet idols,—there would be no defection in the Border States. Hence they are able to claim that it is the selfishness of New York and its envioning communities that keeps Walsh out of the White House.

There are three important counts in the political indictment of Smith: He is wet, he is a Roman Catholic, and he represents Tammany Hall. Only one of these handicaps, again speaking from a Western and Southern viewpoint, runs against Walsh. Moreover the argument is that if Catholic New York and Massachusetts Democracy got behind Walsh, it would eliminate the religious issue forever.

There are a lot of people who insist on solemnity in the President. Well, there never was a more solemn man than Walsh. You could no more develop a scandal about him than about the Lincoln Memorial, social, or political or fiscal. There would be no "Revelry" in the White House with him on the job. His respectability is monumental. If he shaved off his mustache he would need only a stock to look like one of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence, with his dominating nose, his cold gray eyes, and his beetling black brows. Time was and not so long ago that he adhered to the Western official fashion of wearing his mustache *a la* walrus. He cropped it about the time he became a national figure, thereby lopping off fifteen years from his age appearance, as well as two inches of drooping hair. He is sixty-eight, according to the records, which means little; he was as old at thirty and will be just as young at ninety.

Charles Evans Hughes became Governor and had a shot at the Presidency—which would have been a bull's eye if he had adjusted his political wind gauge and foresight—by reason of his turning the light on a lot of insurance rascality. If Walsh had come from some more important State than Montana, he would have profited as much. His Teapot Dome and Elk Hills performance is really a classic in muckraking. He went into the oil investigation on a shoestring. All he had to start with was a couple of leases to Sinclair and Doheny, and some sudden pros-

perity of Albert B. Fall. The elder LaFollette had buzzed around these circumstances and reached nowhere. The committee that inherited the investigation generally felt that, after all, the validity of the leases hinged on whether it was a good or a bad deal for the Government, and there was as much authority for the position that it was necessary to operate the reserved fields to prevent their being drained by nearby wells, as for the other theory. That committee had not been going two days before it changed its identity and ever after was the "Walsh committee." He was not its chairman; Lenroot, who had the title, was lost in the shuffle and Walsh simply took possession of the show. When Edward B. McLean came out with his declaration that he had loaned Fall \$100,000, taking his notes and a mortgage on the Fall ranches as security, all of the members, except Walsh, thought the bottom had fallen out of the scandal. It was so perfectly credible; just such a thing as McLean might have done, in view of his membership in the Harding circle of which Fall was so conspicuous an ornament. They advised Walsh to close the investigation and leave the matter of the validity of the leases to the courts. Not he; his nose was on the trail and he intended to follow it, so he hiked off to Florida, put McLean under oath, and the excuse for Fall's sudden prosperity was blown sky high with McLean's admission that the checks he handed Fall were returned uncashed, and that his previous story was merely his "going down the line for a friend".

There followed as a natural sequence the coming to the witness stand of Doheny, with his little black satchel, and the tale of an old prospector's affection for his one time trail mate. It was an appealing picture with its mellowed reflection of the dim frontier; the soft side of a hard boiled oil multimillionaire, of youthful companionship in poverty and hardship merging into the friendship of men in the decline of life. It sounded as plausible as the McLean story—to everybody but Walsh. To him it was only scenery along the route he had marked out, and he herded the two of them into the criminal courts.

The implacability of Walsh stands him in relief among his fellows. Senators, as a rule, are amiable chaps, full bodied, easy going, sparing of effort, tender of amenities, tolerant of

their adversaries. Through this comfortable aggregation Walsh stalks, grandly serious; always in earnest. There is something suggestive of those old familiars of the Inquisition about him; a consciousness of rectitude, unblemished by any concern with the feelings of those on the rack. He and Fall had been colleagues for many years and there was between them the community of thought so marked among the Westerners. They were not intimates—Walsh has no intimates. It is doubtful if he ever called a brother Senator by his first name, but he was on as good terms with Fall as with anybody; yet when he became satisfied of Fall's turpitude he went after him with cold ferocity. Newberry was a pleasant Senator; even his political foes felt sorry for him, and were disposed to find excuses for his splurging in his campaign, but Walsh saw only the wickedness and not only never let up himself but saw to it that the others stood to the task of getting Newberry out of the Senate. Denby was another of the victims to Walsh's icy logic, and thin lipped fanaticism for righteousness.

Denby would be Secretary of the Navy yet if it had not been for Walsh's speech demanding his resignation, with its overwhelming concentration of fact. Yet during that lethal address Walsh never once raised his voice. It is rare that he does. He stood at his own desk, dryly, concisely and pitilessly dissecting the Secretary of the Navy, much as he had taken Newberry to pieces and exhibited the fragments, and when he had finished one more distinguished scalp swung at his belt.

When he once starts on his machine-gunning, it is a pretty good idea for other people to keep out of the brush, for Walsh is likely to shoot at any suspicious movement. The incident concerning Senator Smoot of Utah was typical. Doheny was on the witness stand before the committee, Walsh was harrying him, and Smoot sat immediately at Walsh's right.

"What," demanded the Inquisitor, suddenly, "was in the note Senator Smoot handed you when you entered the Chamber today?"

His fellow committeeman, his associate for a generation, his frequent co-worker by virtue of being from an adjacent State, with identical local interests, was appalled at this straining of Senatorial courtesy, and had to explain that he had merely asked

the great oil magnate the result of an expert examination on some oil land which Doheny had undertaken for a friend of Smoot's.

There are two reasons why Walsh does not rant. In the first place, his voice is such that when he lifts it there sometimes comes forth a falsetto squeak instead of a robust roar; in the second place, his sense of order is too intense to permit any display of passion. Hence he speaks as he dresses—so immaculately that it would be an equal relief to hear him split an infinitive or see him with his necktie awry. He is just as exasperatingly sure of his facts as he is of his words, wherefore the Senators have largely given over debating with him. What is the use in arguing with a man who reads incessantly law, history, economics, and remembers every printed page as well as everything he ever heard? It is doubtful if any other legislator could have had that law passed that assesses a fine of \$100,000 on a witness who refuses to come to court from over the sea, but Walsh wanted the witnesses against Sinclair, and he poured forth a river of precedents, authorities and processes, and the Senate as usual took his word for it that the enactment was constitutional.

Being a great constitutionalist is not all near-beer and skittles. A Democrat who could have gone along with the farmers on the McNary-Haugen bill would have had a tremendous pull in the Middle West, particularly as things seemed to point to the nomination by the Republicans of a candidate who will not subscribe to that chapter in the Grangers' Bible. Moreover Walsh's own State is farm-minded. It would be as Radical as Wisconsin, if Walsh permitted. But the equalization fee feature of the bill involved a delegation of the taxing power of Congress—treason, barratry, piracy, sacrilege! Some scores of his colleagues voted for it blithely, on the theory that the Supreme Court would kill it if the President did not, and that meanwhile election would have come and gone. Those farmer votes, perhaps, meant more to Walsh than to any man in the Senate; there was also the Democratic urge to make things unhappy for Coolidge. It made no difference. There was that nice point of constitutionality; he could see nothing else, and he voted "No".

The hero of this recital stands accused of self esteem and selfishness. Knowing as much as he knows, and how little the

other fellow knows, could hardly be productive of any other appraisal of his own capabilities. The incident oftenest cited to sustain the charge is his refusal to take the Vice-Presidential nomination on the ticket with John W. Davis in 1924. Another man might have been carried away by the excitement of the wind-up of the Madison Square Garden convention, but not its chairman. He had no delusions about Davis's chances; he had no desire to sacrifice himself on the altar of party distress. He had been mentioned all through the convention as a possible compromise between McAdoo and Smith, but nothing came of that, and he concluded that he would rather be an elected Senator than a defeated tail to a national ticket. His friend and colleague, Burton K. Wheeler, had cast his hope of larger things into the discard and gone charging off with LaFollette,—because he liked LaFollette and the things for which LaFollette stood,—though he had no more delusions as to the outcome of the election than had Walsh, who probably attributed Wheeler's adventure to the instability of youth.

Nevertheless Walsh is a pretty good Democrat and a real Liberal. He showed the latter when he banged away at Attorney-General A. Mitchell Palmer, thereby shocking his fellow Democrats for the treason to the Wilson administration. Palmer was engineering the Red raids during the excitement of the end of the War, and this offended Walsh's sense of constitutional liberty. He joined with Borah in deprecating the hysteria over anarchistic manifestations. "It is only at such times," Walsh wrote, "that the guarantees of the Constitution as to personal rights are of any practical value. In seasons of calm no one thinks of denying them. They are accorded as a matter of course."

He was a good League of Nations man as long as the fight was in the Senate, but when the Versailles treaty had been rejected he calmly announced in a speech that the Democrats would have to make vast concessions if they were ever going to get a treaty ratified. At that moment there was a Democratic superstition that the country would sustain Wilson in the 1920 election. Walsh is not superstitious. With his customary habit of cold analysis he knew that his party was in for a licking, and saw no value in averting his eyes from so evident a destiny.

Such is Walsh's past; what of his future? He starts this session with a crusade on the big light and power combinations. If there is another Teapot Dome hidden in the ramifications of these he will dig it out. Walsh's gun is always loaded and he does not go in for paper chases. He needs an issue with which to focus upon himself national attention adequate to counterbalance the disadvantages of his geographical situation and the comparative political unimportance of his State. Like all the others in the second division of Democratic candidates, his only hope lies in the ability of the dry States to prevent Smith from running away with the nomination. If this is done, the convention becomes a free-for-all, and if Walsh can show, with sufficient melodrama, that the big power trusts threaten the safety of the country, he may be able to coördinate the Progressive sentiment of the West and the corresponding sentiment of the South, which Heflin of Alabama so ineptly typifies by linking it with Ku Kluxism, and thereby get the nomination. Given that opportunity, perhaps he might be able to break the crust of his frigid dignity and rage and storm on the stump. That is really all he needs to be a popular orator. His speeches read classically; there is a hypnotizing accuracy in his massing of facts, and a capacity for making word pictures of his arraignments that is altogether satisfactory. If he could only yell them, he would make an amazing campaign.

If he ever reached the White House, he would be as aggressive as Roosevelt, as judicial as Taft, as self sufficient as Wilson, and as isolated as Coolidge—and as stubborn as all of them put together.

DIPLOMATIC SILENCE

BY R. W. MONTAGUE

IN the event of war it has been an established custom for nations not directly involved to make a formal Declaration of Neutrality at the beginning of hostilities. They have been so dominated by the idea of neutrality, that as the particular war was no concern of theirs they were to stand idly by, trading with each belligerent as far as possible, thus indirectly aiding and abetting each to prolong the war as long as possible; like school boys at a fight, forming a ring round the combatants as spectators only. This established custom, or international convention, for each nation not taking part in actual hostilities to make a formal Declaration of Neutrality in the beginning, I would modify, leaving doubt and uncertainty in the minds of the belligerents instead of a feeling of security. To accomplish this change I would follow the precedent set by the Monroe Doctrine, the one doctrine dear to the American heart, which has stood for one hundred years with ever growing strength and which required no ratification by the Senate.

I would suggest that a new doctrine, to be known as the American Doctrine, or possibly as the Coolidge Doctrine, should be promulgated by the President. The idea could be expressed in many different ways, but to bring out my meaning clearly and to have something definite to discuss I have, for the sake of argument only, made use of the following; but I do not mean that the message should arbitrarily follow this form, only that it should embody the idea in some suitable words:

We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and the nations of the world, to declare that it is the desire of the United States to assist them as far as possible in the unsettled conditions growing out of the late disastrous war; and to declare further that the United States deprecates war and in the event of another war the belligerents can no longer take for granted the neutrality of this country.

The first part is merely complimentary, an expression of good will and a desire to help the world in its distress, and the plan itself is contained in the one short sentence, "in the event of another war the belligerents can no longer take for granted the neutrality of this country."

To some it will appear that it is no plan at all, for a nation can now either take sides or remain neutral; but they forget that a Declaration of Neutrality carries with it a definite legal status, and definite obligations, and the plan proposed is an assertion that the United States will remain free to act at any time as seems best to it and will not in the beginning take upon itself the yoke of neutrality. Such a course would be justified, for slowly there is creeping into men's minds the knowledge that there is no war to which they can be indifferent. The world is now so closely knit together that its interests are common and every war, directly or indirectly, to some extent, touches us all, and it is on this new knowledge that I would build. The proposed doctrine means exactly what it says. It does not mean that the United States commits itself to any course of action whatever. It introduces into international relations a new status. Beside the status of belligerency and the status of neutrality there would be a third course, which might be called the status of silence. Belligerents would construe silence as carrying with it a certain critical attitude which would impress them with the necessity of proceeding with caution. It leaves an element of uncertainty in the minds of the belligerents that would act as a deterrent, and at all events would tend to mitigate the barbarity of war.

An Ambassador sounding the State Department for the attitude of the United States on a threatened war, would be met with some such reply as this:

Your Excellency is of course aware of the policy of the United States and its settled conviction that no war can be waged which does not directly or indirectly affect its interests; and its consequent unwillingness to commit itself at this time to any course of action. But I may add for your Excellency's information, that the American people are an emotional people and are deeply stirred by the horrors of war and, if war is inevitable, their attitude toward the belligerents will be affected by the conduct of the war.

After such a conversation an Ambassador might report to his Government that the United States seemed to take their new doctrine seriously, and perhaps add, with the misunderstanding that every nation has for every other, that there was no predicting what these fool Americans would do. Such a report might cause a nation threatening war to pause and reconsider.

Had the United States assumed such an attitude in the late war, I am fain to believe that the Lusitania would not have been sunk, and that the war would have been conducted on more humane lines; possibly Belgium would not have been invaded. A protest from a country not committed to neutrality would have some real weight, and gradually it would come about that no Power would dare to offend the moral sense of the world. As the plan is not ambitious it would, I believe, be accepted by the country without serious opposition. It bows to our traditions almost superstitiously held by many people. It is clear of partisan politics, and it requires no ratification by the Senate and avoids acrimonious debate. It binds the country to nothing and leaves it free to act as it chooses and when it chooses.

Undoubtedly, there would be criticism of this doctrine, as there was of the Monroe Doctrine, but it would soon evaporate as it could not be organized and become a party issue. The doctrine declares that it is the intention of the United States to remain free. A party that made it an issue that the country should bind itself to a certain course of action in the beginning would not receive the support of politicians, much less of the people, and an unorganized opposition degenerates into loose and ineffective talk. Opposition is a matter of degree. The opposition to the League was organized and aggressive, and the question readily lent itself to partisan politics; and had we joined the League as first written, it is quite possible that our remaining in, or going out, would have been a political issue for years to come, practically nullifying the usefulness of our participation. I do not mean to criticize the advantages of being in the League; very far from that. But as the debate became bitter, to some at least it was more and more apparent that it was doubtful if the country was ready for a direct participation in European affairs until our point of view

had been changed, our imagination quickened, and some such foundation laid as this plan proposes.

As the proposed doctrine is an innovation on established convention, it would probably be misunderstood at first. It might be said that it contained only a threat in disguise. So did the Monroe Doctrine contain a threat, not in disguise but direct and specific. It was as great an innovation as one could well conceive. And yet the Monroe Doctrine has stood the test of time. As the United States was in a peculiar position in 1823, so it is now, and it is strong enough to have a new idea fathered by it accepted generally. However, the conclusion that this plan contains a threat and nothing else is not warranted. The equation is indeterminate and capable of many answers, and that of a threat is not the one which would, I believe, be finally accepted; rather it would come to be recognized as an appeal to reason and expediency.

Until the United States took active part against one or other of the belligerents, friendly relations would exist, but friendly relations must be preserved from day to day. Neutrality consists not so much in words as in acts, and until there was some definite act neutrality would exist as a matter of course. Conditions of trade and all other relations would remain the same as if a formal Declaration of Neutrality had been made. An analogous situation exists in the case of civil war, where one party is anxious for recognition by foreign governments, the other equally anxious to prevent recognition. Once the doctrine was established, there should be no more friction than always exists under the present system, and matters should go more smoothly than they do now. Furthermore, in many instances the doctrine would tend to shift from the neutral to the belligerent nation the burden of deciding whether certain acts done were sufficient to be considered a *casus belli*, a distinct advantage.

Moreover, the plan is exceedingly flexible, allowing the country to begin with what would have been minor breaches of neutrality, until actual war was declared if the country so willed; or to do nothing and remain strictly neutral to the end as it pleased. Such minor acts could be directed impartially against both belligerents if such a course tended to shorten what the country

regarded as an unnecessary war. It would be possible even, in the beginning or at any stage of a war, to make a formal Declaration of Neutrality towards one belligerent and remain silent as to the other. If this doctrine was generally adopted, as the nations would be bound to nothing, they could act separately or collectively as they chose, and it would keep the belligerents uneasy and bring home to them that in the conduct of the war they were before the bar of civilization. In many instances this feeling of uncertainty engendered by the attitude of foreign nations would be strong enough to force arbitration. While small nations immediately adjacent to two powerful belligerents might deem it necessary to shelter themselves under a Declaration of Neutrality, surely great Powers not so directly affected could keep themselves free and wait on events. The plan substitutes freedom of action for the old international convention which expected each nation to declare its position at the beginning of hostilities. It presupposes action, if any is taken, after the event, instead of binding ourselves to a certain course for the future in unknown circumstances.

I lay a good deal of stress on the fact that the proposed plan minimizes opposition. Force is of two kinds, moral in the sense of emotional, and physical, both of which are necessary for results. Physical force alone is insufficient without its supporting moral complement. If an army loses its morale, it is beaten before the battle begins; so that any plan to prevent war must consider how far it will have the moral support of the world, for without it the physical force can never be put forth successfully. In other words, no plan can be effective until the world is sufficiently in sympathy with it to give it whole hearted approval. While I supported the League of Nations and do so now, there was always a misgiving that if we went into the League under the enthusiasm engendered by the war, when that enthusiasm had cooled the country would be unwilling to live up to its engagements and consequently, from my point of view, unable to do so. It was a serious objection to the League of Nations that there was a large minority at least hostile to it. It makes no difference whether this minority was right or wrong in its opposition, it represented a latent force dangerous to the success of the League.

To ignore this is to put one's trust wholly in physical force, as great a fallacy as that of the pacifist who puts his trust in moral force alone.

It was not bad diplomacy on the part of Xenophon who, when the Ambassadors of the King told him that "to advance or retreat is war, but to remain where you are is peace," replied: "It is understood that to advance or retreat is war, to remain where we are is peace," but was careful to refrain from intimating what he intended to do.

Lloyd George in a speech delivered at Niagara Falls, October 11, 1923, said: "The last shot in war would have been fired if the world could be brought to understand that the United States and Great Britain were joined in a compact to ward off future wars." In elaborating his views he said he did not look for or advocate an alliance, but an unwritten pledge between the two nations to stand together in furtherance of future peace. If the United States promulgated the doctrine suggested and England adopted it, would not an approach be made with little friction to such an understanding? It is a commonplace to say that no strike was ever successful unless it had the sympathy of the public; so it might come to be believed that no war would be successful without the sympathy of the outside world, and such a belief would weigh heavily on the civilian population and tend to undermine their morale and gradually a world conscience in regard to war would be built up.

The plan is specific and practical and it contains the idea that it behooves any nation contemplating war to make sure that it can convince the conscience of the world that its cause is just. It excludes nothing and affords a foundation on which a more complete structure can be erected with safety whenever the world is ripe for it. Designing castles in Spain offers a pleasing architectural diversion, but they are unsubstantial because they have no solid foundation to rest on, without which the most beautiful edifice will topple to destruction.

THE CHURCH CRISIS IN ENGLAND

BY J. A. SPENDER

I HAVE read in an American newspaper that the "Churchmen's Union", of which the famous Dean Inge is President and which has just declared its approval of the stand taken by Dr. Barnes, the Bishop of Birmingham, on behalf of a modernist theology, is "the leading Church organization" in England. This is not so. The Churchmen's Union, though influential in virtue of the ability and distinction of some of its members, represents only a small body of Liberal Churchmen, and their support of the Bishop of Birmingham does not indicate any official approval of his attitude. The official view, so far as it can be expressed from the seat of authority, has been stated by the Archbishop of Canterbury, who in his rejoinder to the Bishop's "open letter" to him has indicated his strong disapproval of the Bishop's handling of the sacramental doctrine held by large numbers—probably the majority—of practising members of the Church of England.

Let me try to state, as fairly as I can, what is the present state of religious controversy in the Church of England. Undoubtedly the High Church party is in the ascendant, and its principal organization, the English Church Union, is largely dominated by its more extreme members. But a distinction must be made between moderate and extreme High Churchmen. Except that they reject the doctrine of Papal infallibility and disown the jurisdiction of Rome, the extremists hold beliefs which are barely distinguishable from those of the Roman Church, and their leader, Lord Halifax, is active in seeking reunion with Rome. In recent years he held conferences to promote that object with the late Cardinal Mercier at Malines, and though these failed of any immediate result, the obstacles were apparently disciplinary rather than doctrinal—the refusal of Rome to recognize Anglican Orders and its demand of a complete submission which would extinguish the Church of England and merge it in Rome. But

while they object to this, the extreme High Churchmen insist on their right to hold and practise within the Anglican Church what is practically the full sacramental doctrine of the Roman Church, basing themselves on "the Mass" or Eucharist as the cardinal act of worship in the Church, and regarding the Ministry as a sacrificing priesthood on the ancient model. To them the Consecrated Wafer has the same sanctity as to the Roman, and in recent years they have revived the practice of "reserving" it for the adoration of the faithful, and have introduced services, like Benediction, which are a part of Roman worship. Their churches are little if at all distinguishable from the Roman in outward aspect; incense is freely used in them; the priests wear vestments, and the Confessional and penance are a regular part of their discipline.

There is no doubt that some of these practices are illegal, and many of them have been so pronounced by the Court of Arches and the Privy Council. Still more they seem to the layman to fly in the face of the Thirty-Nine Articles which appear, on any ordinary construction of words, definitely to disallow the doctrine of Transubstantiation. But a kind of traditional casuistry has grown up about these Articles; the extreme High Churchman points out that some of them are plainly obsolete, and if some, why not others? Moreover, he claims that the Church of England has a continuous "Catholic" history which was not broken but only temporarily interrupted at the Reformation. He looks back especially to the post-Reformation "Catholic" revival of the Seventeenth Century under Archbishop Laud and others of the same school and, while he regards the Eighteenth Century as the "dark ages" of the Church, he claims that the true tradition was rediscovered in the Oxford Movement of the Nineteenth Century.

The moderate High Churchman walks the *via media* between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. Cardinal Newman sarcastically described it as "steering between the Scylla of Aye and Charybdis of Nay through the channel of no-meaning", but it commends itself to the English habit of compromise. The moderate High Churchman holds the sacramental doctrine but in a manner which distinguishes it from the Roman doctrine and

makes it conformable to the Thirty-Nine Articles. In former days he used to speak of this doctrine as "Consubstantiation" to distinguish it from "Transubstantiation", but he too believes in the Eucharist as the central act of Christian worship, and holds the belief to which Bishop Barnes takes exception, that some mystical, if not miraculous, change is wrought in the Elements by the act of consecration. As a rule he is moderate in his ritual, but he too lays his stress on the doctrines and sacraments of the Church.

Unquestionably these two parties have been gaining at the expense of the Evangelicals, who are now only a minority with little representation on either the Bench of Bishops or the chief benefices of the Church. The Broad Church party, which in the days of Thomas Arnold, Frederick Denison Maurice and Robertson of Brighton, seemed to be gaining in strength and influence, is now all but extinguished. There are eminent individuals, like the Dean of St. Paul's, who influence by their writings, but there are no commanding preachers of this school, and one seldom hears now, as one did frequently in former years, any church or congregation called "Broad".

And yet the probability is that the great majority of the laity, so far as they call themselves Churchmen, belong to this school and that their estrangement from the dominant party among the clergy is the main cause of the decline in Church membership and in the number of candidates offering themselves for ordination in the Church of England. The Anglo-Catholic clergy have had great success in filling a certain number of the churches, especially in the towns, with congregations of devout worshippers (largely composed of women), and many of them have been active and zealous in parish work, which has given them a place in the hearts of the poor. But their teaching has failed to attract the thinking and educated laymen who thirty or forty years ago were the backbone of Anglican congregations, and makes little or no appeal to the multitude of simple people who think of Christianity as a doctrine for life and conduct and do not understand ecclesiasticism. In the hands of Anglo-Catholics, Christianity tends to become an intensive cult for the benefit of the few, and the claim of the Church to be "national" becomes more and more

remote from the facts. This is so far recognized by the Anglo-Catholics that many of them say openly that they would rather be separated from the State than surrender any part of their doctrine which they think important.

These circumstances must be borne in mind, if the controversy about the Revised Prayer Book—which, after being accepted by the House of Lords, has been overwhelmingly rejected by the House of Commons—is to be understood. For the last twenty years or more the Bishops had been at work on this revision, and they had produced an alternative Prayer Book—to be adopted at the discretion of the local church councils with the sanction of the Bishop—which undoubtedly was in some ways an improvement on the existing book and gave the clergy greater freedom in the conduct of public worship.

But among the changes proposed were some which raised in an acute form the controversies about sacramental doctrine. The Archbishop of Canterbury asserted that there was no change of doctrine in the new book, but he did not succeed in carrying all his brethren with him, and the general impression was that the Anglo-Catholics had gained. They got, for example, a definite legalization of the wearing of vestments and other ritual practices, to which they attach importance, and they obtained permission to “reserve” the Sacrament, provided its use was only for the sick and that precautions were taken against its “adoration”. This, it is true, did not satisfy the extremists, who held out for the legalization of the entire doctrine of the Mass, including adoration; but it was strenuously resisted by the Evangelicals, and it struck other people as a compromise which was little likely to be observed. It was pointed out that the concession of “reservation” for the sick conceded practically the whole doctrine for which the Anglo-Catholics are contending, since it transferred to the Sacred Wafer the mystical efficacy which the other parties contended belongs to the communion service and the participation of the communicants. When so much is granted, how, it was asked, can the rest be resisted? If the consecrated element has this efficacy for the sick, how can it be other than an object of veneration; and how can the Bishops prevent its becoming so?

The Protestant and Catholic issue is thus raised in its acutest

form, and a certain number of zealous persons in both camps threaten secession whichever view is finally taken. But there is something more at stake than a contention between these parties, who between them are only a small minority of the public which, if the Church of England is in any sense national, have an interest and a right to speak about its constitution and doctrine. I think I interpret the view of those laymen with whom I am best acquainted when I say it is one of surprise that the dignitaries of the Church should be spending so much time and energy in debating the more or less of a return to mediævalism, when what is so plainly needed is a restatement of Christian doctrine in terms of modern thought. To them the whole of this controversy is remote and unreal and they look for the revival of religion and the religious spirit on altogether different lines.

It is to these that Bishop Barnes is appealing, and he is clearly alive to the danger that the cause of religion may go by default while ecclesiastics revive the Sixteenth Century controversies about the Mass. He has taken an explosive way of making himself heard, and a legalist who takes a literal view of the formalities of the Church may object that he is on the same doubtful ground as some of the other controversialists. Already the question is being asked whether a Bishop can remain a Bishop and declare a large part of Anglican theology to be obsolete. Yet there is no doubt that he speaks for the great number of religious-minded laymen, who find it impossible to reconcile that theology with scientific knowledge and yet believe that Christian teaching has inexhaustible value for the modern world. The question which he raises is a question not only for the Anglican Church but for all religious denominations. It is whether the religion of the spirit can be rescued from the battles about ritual and dogma, and made vital and actual to the men and women of today.

HAPHAZARD EUGENICS

BY DONALD LINES JACOBUS

A SCIENTIST made an intensive study of a few remote New England towns where the old families still resided, almost unaffected by outside influences. He found that the percentage of imbecility, deaf-mutism and degenerative disorders of all kinds was much higher in these selected towns than in the cities or through the country at large. Not satisfied with presenting his statistics, he sought an explanation of the phenomenon. These country people, he reasoned, living in isolated communities, must have married almost exclusively among themselves, so he attributed their deterioration to inbreeding.

It is much more fascinating to speculate about facts than to observe and catalogue them. I shall not quarrel with the statistics proving the relatively high percentage of imbecility among the inhabitants of remote New England towns, for these statistics may be quite accurate. Neither shall I quarrel with the scientist's contention that the intermarriage of near kin is more common in small towns than in large cities, for I know this to be a fact. But what reason is there to assume, as he does, that the second fact is the cause and explanation of the first? Is this not a mere scientific guess? I should like to try my own hand at guessing, for I believe that the history of New England offers a better explanation of the deterioration of her old-time families than does my scientist's theory of inbreeding.

Since most of the early settlers in New England were farmers, they required a great deal of land; and, roughly speaking, there was plenty of land for all comers and for their descendants until about the time of the Revolutionary War. In this war a large percentage of the able bodied men sooner or later saw active service. Homes were broken up; many well-to-do families were financially ruined; and a large number of youths were left unsettled and discontented with their environment. After the war,

many New England families sought new homes in mountainous Vermont and throughout New York State, later pushing on to Ohio and farther west. New England became a mighty reservoir pouring its choicest streams through all the western lands. As the cities grew in size and the great factories were built, youths from the country districts flocked to these centers of activity. Who went to the cities? Bright, alert boys, eager to make their fortunes. And who went west? The hardy adventurous sons of the soil. And who were left to till the paternal acres? The weaklings, those who lacked initiative, in some cases the diseased and the depraved. Is it any wonder that, if you would find the best blood of New England, you may seek it anywhere—except in rural New England?

Remove, for four successive generations, the sturdiest and most talented individuals from a small remote town, with practically no influx of new blood to take their place, and is it surprising if the stock deteriorates?

This deterioration has often been remarked, and various explanations have been put forward. The rabid prohibitionist would attribute it to rum and hard cider, the guessing scientist to inbreeding or whatever his pet theory may happen to be. Let us grant that rum and inbreeding and other factors may have played a part. I am not trying to prove a theory of my own. I presented a theory, a reasonable and plausible theory as I believe, for the sole purpose of showing that my theorizing scientist, in riding his hobby of inbreeding, had overlooked a whole set of facts which are adequate to explain his statistics. This sort of guessing serves no useful purpose.

A flagrant example of scientific guessing is to be found in a pamphlet entitled *How to Make a Eugenical Family Study*, a Bulletin of the Eugenics Record Office. In discussing the importance of new blood brought into a family by marriage, it states: "The fact that the nature of the mating does influence the progeny is well brought out by the study of half fraternities, both those in which the father and those in which the mother is the common parent. . . . One of them may serve us now as an illustration." Then follows an account of "a man whom we may call John Wolley," his two wives and his children by each mar-

riage. So many details and dates are given that anyone at all familiar with the colonial history of Connecticut can easily identify the fictitious "John Wolley" with the Rev. John Davenport (1668–1731) of Stamford. The first wife of this gentleman, according to the pamphlet, was Martha Silver (fictitious name for Martha Gold), who came of a respectable but undistinguished family, and the children and descendants of this union were quiet, steady folk, farmers and the like. The second wife was a Morris (the pamphlet gives her real name), and from this union sprang two sons. The elder—we will drop the pseudonyms—was Abraham Davenport, the colonial statesman celebrated in Whittier's poem. The younger was James, a brilliant but erratic clergyman. The later descendants of the Morris wife "include leading merchants, manufacturers and inventors." The "tremendous contrast between these two sets of half brothers" is attributed to the different strains of blood introduced by their mothers, the two wives of the Rev. John Davenport. For whereas the Gold wife was of mediocre family, the mother of the brilliant set of brothers was "a daughter of John Morris, of one of the leading families of New York and New Jersey of colonial times—great land holders from which Morrisania, now in the Bronx Borough, New York City, and Morris County, New Jersey, are named."

It is obvious that the plausibility of this explanation of an actual phenomenon—the difference in mental ability between these two sets of half brothers—depends entirely on the accuracy of the statement that the mother of the brilliant set of brothers belonged to the famous Morris family of Morrisania. Now the fact is, she was in no way connected with that family. Her correct parentage is proved beyond question by contemporary records. She was a daughter of John Morris of New Haven, Connecticut, of a respectable but mediocre family, a family no more distinguished than the Gold family to which the first wife belonged. What are we to think when we find a scientific theory exemplified by alleged facts which turn out, when examined, to be untrue?

A belief in heredity has existed since the beginning of history. Men have always felt that "there is something in it." Our

fathers, however, did not attribute human character to heredity alone; they spoke of the influence of training, discipline and good companionship. It is the modern fashion of eugenics to eliminate education and environment almost entirely, and to attribute to heredity not only physical traits but mental and moral traits as well. So far as physical traits are concerned, we have no quarrel with the scientists. The evidence is adequate to prove that such things as blue eyes and the tendency to have twins are inherited. Mental and moral characteristics, however, present many obstacles to the investigator. We can see blue eyes, but we cannot see a man's honesty. We cannot judge character until we know a man well, and even then we are liable to surprises. A man's reputation and the impression he makes on us may suffice for social and business intercourse, but for scientific purposes a minute knowledge of his traits is essential. It is obvious that in most studies of this sort the facts must be incomplete and the percentage of error high.

It is amusing to note the antagonism between the theories of the eugenists and those of the psychoanalysts. The former explain human traits on biological grounds in accord with the Mendelian laws of heredity; the latter explain them on psychological grounds as due to the early reactions of infancy and childhood. If we accept the dogmas of one school, we must reject most of the dogmas of the other. In this situation, is it not amazing that these two opposed scientific schools have already exerted a powerful influence on many of our activities, such as institutional and social welfare work, mental hygiene and penology?

One reason for suspecting the application of the principles of heredity to human mentality, is the very plausibility of the current theories. If a man analyses his own traits of character, he recognizes some which he possesses in common with his father, his mother, or his grandparents. But as a rule he will also find some traits whose source he is unable to trace. The eugenists have an explanation ready. These traits of mysterious origin must be an inheritance, latent through the intervening generations, from some more remote ancestor. Let us admit the possibility; does it not prove too much? For somewhere up the an-

cestral tree you are almost bound to find what you are looking for.

For example, take the celebrated insanity of two recent kings of Bavaria, Ludwig II and Otto. It would be natural to assume that insanity which affected two brothers must be of an hereditary type, but this case was made difficult by the absence of mental disorder in any of the near ancestry or kin. Here was a situation that called for desperate measures. One German scientist had already expressed the opinion that the Bavarian insanity could not have been of an hereditary type; but another leaped into the breach and saved the cause. In the remote ancestry of the Bavarian brothers, back in the Sixteenth Century, two or three progenitors were located who were actually insane, and three or four others who were suspiciously eccentric. Granted such latitude, it is possible to prove anything. If insanity can leap three centuries and light on two unfortunate brothers, then it is possible for any man to inherit any trait.

It should be unnecessary to call attention to the fact, which is yet so easily lost sight of, that the normal is the mediocre. Both genius and subnormal mentality are but runlets that owe their origin to the broad sluggish stream of mediocrity, and both tend to return to it. If we may judge by their publications, the eugenists have somewhat neglected middle-class families and those of average mentality, and have made a particular study of families that are much above or much below normal; families of degenerates or imbeciles such as the Jukes or Kallikaks, and families of extraordinary talent such as the House of Orange, the Wedgwood-Darwin-Galton tribe or the kin of Jonathan Edwards. Comparisons, or rather contrasts, between these extreme types have frequently been drawn, and are apt to prove misleading; for the reader gets the impression, which of course no genuine scientist intends to convey, that mental taints and moral obliquities are confined to the "low-class" families at the bottom of the social ladder, and that unusual ability is the inheritance solely of the cultured classes.

Yet the scientists themselves cannot be entirely absolved on this score. For over twenty years, the eugenists have employed the Edwards family as the classic American example of the inheritance of desirable traits. In books and in magazine

articles, reference has been made to this family again and again. Now why is it that the writers of these books and articles almost invariably fail to mention the fact that the grandmother of Jonathan Edwards was insane and came of a family where a violent type of insanity was prevalent? Why is it that they fail to state the fact that one of the sons of Jonathan Edwards was notoriously dissolute? Surely, these facts are of eugenical significance. Do the eugenists fear that the mention of them would detract from the force of their favorite example? No, let us give them the benefit of the doubt. The eugenists, in their study of noted families, often make use of published genealogies. Now the family historian cannot in the nature of things be true and impartial. For one thing, he is writing of his own family; what is more, if he hopes to sell copies of his book to other members of the family, he must omit anything that might be considered discreditable. In consequence, published genealogies are of little use to students of heredity, except as a starting-point for scientific investigation. And because of the inaccuracies, in many cases the amateurishness, of the compilers of these works, it is frequently unsafe to use them even to this extent.

There are other reasons why it is difficult for the eugenists to obtain, and properly weigh, the facts which relate to members of "high-class" families. There is a natural tendency, if a man occupies a prominent position, to attribute to him more than average ability; yet it is often true that any man of average mentality, given the same education and opportunity, could hold the same position as capably. Then, too, it is frequently difficult to learn the real facts concerning the black sheep of "good" families. The chicken thief is usually prosecuted when caught; thefts committed by men of high social or business position often remain undisclosed because of the injury which prosecution would inflict on institutions with which they are connected.

Can trustworthy deductions be drawn from facts which are so likely to be incomplete and to contain a fairly high percentage of error? It must be remembered also that in most instances the scientists do not themselves gather the facts; this labor is usually performed by "field workers", young persons who have previously received a brief course of instruction in general prin-

ciples and methods of research. Upon their accuracy and acumen in collecting facts and in judging the people they meet, depends the trustworthiness of the conclusions and theories which the eugenists draw from this material. By far the greater part of the investigating that has been done up to the present time, has been among families which have relatives in public institutions as the result of insanity, imbecility, criminality or pauperism, and these families to a considerable extent belong to the lower classes of society. Neither the scientists nor their field workers, as a rule, possess a personal or practical knowledge of the conditions under which the lower classes live. They merely come in contact with these people in institutions, or else visit their homes as outsiders, as representatives of institutions. It would seem inevitable, in these circumstances, that scientific deductions should suffer from sheer lack of human understanding.

Those who ridicule eugenics as a silly fad do not realize the respect now felt for it by workers in other fields of science, or the growing influence which it exerts. In fact, the average layman today has ceased to ridicule eugenics, and is beginning to take it seriously; for the average layman believes, as he puts it, that "you can't get away from the facts." The scientists have studied families by the thousand and individuals by the hundred thousand, and their conclusions are supposed to be based on this mass of material. Many of these studies have been published; but since it is necessary, in most of them, to employ fictitious names and to withhold all actual names of people and places, it is unfortunately impossible for the layman to verify the alleged facts. For this reason it seems important to call attention to a few specific instances in which the eugenists have been guilty of error; to discuss the limitations and defects of their methods; and to consider a few of the factors which make it extremely difficult for them to obtain and circulate absolutely dependable information. In view of all this, we are justified in inquiring if the "established principles" of eugenics are anything more authoritative than a series of more or less likely guesses.

We cannot get away from the facts, it is true; the real question is, can we *get* the facts?

THE STOCK MARKET AND BUSINESS

BY LEWIS H. HANEY

Director, New York University Bureau of Business Research

RARELY, if ever, has the stock market appeared to get so far out of touch with business conditions as it has in the last year or two. Between the bottom of the market reached in 1921 and the peak reached in September, 1927, there was an advance of well over 150 per cent. The average of fifty stocks, including twenty-five railway stocks, showed an advance of about 185 per cent., and the average of 199 industrial stocks about 175 per cent. Compared with such gains, the increase in the volume of business, whether measured in physical quantities or values, appears to be relatively small. Between 1921 and recent months, the tonnage hauled by the railways of the country increased only forty-seven per cent., and the quantity of commodities produced by the leading industries of the country increased only 64 per cent. Thus it may safely be said that representative active stocks have risen in value much more than twice as fast as our industrial activity. When one estimates the value of the total quantity of commodities produced, one finds that the gain in the last seven years has been not over 87 per cent., while it may be estimated that total retail sales have increased by only 83 per cent. The total volume of bank checks drawn against individual accounts—and this includes speculative transactions on the stock market itself—is but 87 per cent. larger than at the low point in 1921. In short, stocks have advanced about twice as fast as the value of business. It is little wonder, then, that beginning last October the feeling became prevalent that the market was too far out of step with business conditions and that a decline in stock prices was due.

One of the chief factors in determining the trend of any given stock, and consequently the trend of all stocks, is the outlook for net earnings. Rarely is even a manipulative advance attempted without an accompanying effort to support the move by reference

to alleged improvement in earnings. Obviously, upon earnings depend in large part the dividends that can be paid.

But the earnings in various particular industries, or of stocks in a given industry, may not move in the same direction. As the earnings of sulphur companies and mail order houses increase, the earnings of shipping and coal companies may decrease. Thus it becomes difficult to think of business earnings as having a general trend, and, on account of the divergence in earnings, prices of particular stocks may move in opposite directions. There has been an unusual lack of uniformity in the trends in various industries during the last two or three years, and some companies have prospered while their competitors in the same industry have lost ground. Naturally, it has been very difficult under the circumstances for the stock market to reflect a general movement.

The point, however, is merely that earnings, and the resulting dividends, of necessity are an important factor in determining stock prices, and that consequently the stock market must have a close relation to business conditions. This is why speculators are so interested in the general trend of commodity prices, the volume of car loadings, bank clearings, steel production, and other indexes that tend to reflect the general trend of business. The scope and expense of the arrangements maintained by Wall Street for research into conditions affecting the earnings of business concerns are amazing. An army of private economists, statisticians, analysts and investigators is employed. A stream of wires, cables, reports, and statements is continually being digested. And most of this is for the purpose of getting prompt and correct information bearing on earnings.

The second factor that must affect stock prices is the basis used for capitalizing income, or, in other words, the interest rate. This has been one of the most important factors in the great bull market of the last few years. Back in 1921 the average cost of funds to the speculator in stocks was well over 5 per cent. and toward the end of the year averaged 5.15 per cent. In November, 1927, however, the same funds could be secured at an average rate of 3.73 per cent. If this rate be taken as representative of the basis of capitalization, it would make a difference of nearly 30 per cent. in the price of a given security which has yielded a fixed in-

come throughout the period. The average yield on bonds rose to about 6 per cent. in 1921, while it was only 4.43 per cent. in the fall of 1927.

During these years there has been a general downward trend in the basis of capitalization. This has been due in part to increasing certainty as to the future of business both here and abroad, which in turn has been helped by less fear of political and legal complications. The chief economic factor has been a decrease in the productivity of capital equipment. As the supply of capital equipment has increased, the value of the product per unit of investment in plant and equipment has decreased. When, as at present, the supply of funds invested in factories, machinery, and the like is very large, and the industrial plant of the nation is able to produce more commodities than the market will absorb at prevailing prices, it is a fair assumption that the least efficient units of capital equipment yield a low return. This is but another way of saying that the interest rate on invested capital has declined, and that the value of a fixed income has increased.

All things considered, the basis of capitalizing income seems likely to work gradually lower during the years to come. The supply of funds seeking investment, thanks to the savings from past earnings, is enormous; and in comparison with any time since the beginning of the World War the outlook for general social stability in Europe and America offers greater certainty, which always means a tendency toward lower discount rates. In the early years of the century, the average yield on bonds was in the neighborhood of four per cent., and there seems to be no reason why such a yield may not again appear.

In another way, business, through interest rates, is related to the stock market, namely, through the short time rates existing in the "call loan" and "time loan" markets. In these markets, stock brokers and speculators borrow funds with which to finance purchases or sales of stocks. A very large volume of stocks is bought "on margin", meaning that a part of the price is advanced by the broker who borrows funds in the money markets. Now when large supplies of funds are accumulated in the New York money market, both call loan and time loan rates are low. Indeed, the low money rates tell us that funds are in abundant supply. If, at

the same time, the average price of stocks is such that the dividends paid afford a yield that is higher than the cost of money, speculators will reason that it pays to buy stocks. If one can borrow money for $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., as has been the case, and the average yield on a representative group of high grade stocks is over 5 per cent., it is easy to see that a profit can be made by turning borrowed money into borrowed stocks.

Money is most likely to be abundant in the New York market when business is quiet. A great business boom often generates conditions which bring an end to a stock market advance merely by withdrawing funds from the New York market and forcing money rates up to a level which restricts normal speculative buying.

Of course, stocks differ widely in their responsiveness to these various factors. The more highly speculative securities are influenced more largely by the chances for an increase or a decrease in the earnings of the company concerned, and by the degree of ease in the short time money market. The sounder investment securities are, like bonds, more influenced by the basis of capitalization; for in such cases the earnings and dividends are relatively secure, which leaves the fundamental interest rate as the chief factor affecting their capital value. It follows that the more speculative stocks are more closely related to the current trend of business conditions than are the investment stocks. High grade bonds, which contain almost no speculative possibilities, may be said to have no relation to business except as such conditions may affect the rate of return on invested capital as a basis of capitalizing fixed incomes. Bonds are apt to be at high prices when business is poor—an almost inverse relationship.

In a general way, the foregoing factors work out as follows. If the general prosperity of a country increases and the average earnings of its business concerns grow, the prospects for companies whose earnings have been low are improved and the prices of their stocks rise. At the same time, the expansion of business requires the use of greater supplies of funds, and money is withdrawn from the New York market. This causes the short time money markets to tighten and call and time loan rates to rise. If the process goes far enough there comes a time when money is

so scarce that speculators find difficulty in securing it and money rates rise above the yields to be secured from the ownership of stocks. If, at the same time, the prospects for further increase in business prosperity become less bright as is always the case sooner or later, the rise in stocks is checked and a wave of selling may develop. It is this inter-relation of the outlook for earnings and the level of money rates that causes speculative stocks to vary in price, and it will be apparent that the variation is apt to come in advance of an actual decline in business.

One exception may be noted, and that for the reason that it has been illustrated in the high level of stock prices in recent years. If money is so abundant that even a large expansion in business causes no monetary stringency, stocks may not reflect the business cycle, or at least do so only tardily and partially. And if, as is not improbable, there is also a declining trend in the basis of capitalization, this tends to counteract any reduction in security prices. Such has been the situation in the recent past. Investment stocks are sustained by the lower capitalization rate, and even the more speculative stocks are held up by the extraordinary abundance of funds in the New York market, an abundance which the usual Fall requirements in connection with the marketing of the crops the past year failed to reduce. The abnormal condition of the money markets in this country has allowed us to pass through a complete cyclical upswing and downswing in business without causing more than a ripple in the stock market.

This does not mean that the stock market has lost its barometric significance. Anyone who will take the trouble to examine the course of the stock market averages over a long series of years and compare them with any index or indexes of the volume of business, will find that, with exceptions so few as merely to illustrate the truth of the rule, the stock market has faithfully anticipated the major swings in business. Probably the chief exception is that which has developed in these last few years and that as already explained is largely due to the abnormal post-war condition of the money markets in this country. Even so, it will be recalled that there was a very sharp setback in the stock market in March, 1926, and that, while the averages have reached new heights, the market has been unusually irregular since that

time—irregular in the sense that while the leading stocks that are included in most of the averages have advanced, many stocks have declined.

This observation suggests the question, What is “business”? It is perhaps not so easy to arrive at a picture of business in general as is sometimes taken for granted. If there is no general trend of business, then, naturally, the stock market cannot be expected to anticipate such a trend. Last Autumn, for example, such measures of business as bank debits and the sales of chain stores and mail order houses had rather steadily advanced, while at the same time the production of pig iron and building activity had been declining. It has become more difficult to speak of “the business cycle”, for the reason that the ups and downs of business in particular industries have not come at the same time. The individual cycles have overlapped, which has given a confused and irregular appearance to business as a whole. Under these circumstances the stock market movement has also been confused and irregular, which but demonstrates its close relation to business conditions. Cyclical movements in the individual stocks, not coming at the same time, are blended in an irregular movement. We find coal stocks on the whole declining since 1922, while the stocks of food producing companies as a group have shown an almost uninterrupted upward trend since 1921. Shipping stocks have faithfully reflected the long depression in the shipping industry, while chain store stocks have with equal faithfulness shown the continued expansion of the companies which issued them.

In short, the stock market must by the very nature of the forces which control it be closely related to business, and when that market appears to reflect business conditions but haltingly it is almost certain to be due to the existence of irregularity and divergent trends in the business world. At such times we find increasing “discrimination” in the buying of stocks. This merely means that investors and speculators are not buying shares in business in general, because some particular businesses are not in a desirable condition. The averages for a particular group of stocks may not fit our notion of what the general condition of business is, but we must remember that such averages do not

reflect the movement of all stocks and that there is no uniform trend in business as a whole.

The trend of the stock market also reacts upon business conditions. It affects "sentiment", because it is recognized as a good barometer and because losses or gains in the stock market are often widespread. More important, however, is the effect that heavy speculation in the stock market exercises on the supply of funds. The volume of loans by New York stock brokers is equal to about four billion dollars. This is about 30 per cent. of the total net demand deposits of the member banks of the Federal Reserve System, and is over half as large as the commercial loans of such banks. The total loans of the member banks that are made on stock and bond collateral other than Government securities amount to over 40 per cent. of their total loans and discounts. The condition of bank credit is profoundly affected. It is not improbable that at the present time the banks of the country as a whole are more deeply involved in the stock market, either as investors or lenders, than is consistent with sound commercial banking principles, and that bank credit for business purposes may turn out to be limited as a result. No one knows how large a part of the loans referred to is based on bonds, but the stock market factor is a large one.

The stock market has undergone great changes in the last few years and these have somewhat altered its basis of appraisal and its reactions to business conditions. Probably its recent course is partly due to the transition to a new régime. Among these changes may be the following:

1—A great increase in the number of persons interested in stocks. The average man has had a higher income and has probably saved more. He has been educated in investment, beginning with Liberty Bond campaigns and ending with the appeals of investment trusts. Tens of thousands of employees have been offered special inducements to buy stock in their companies, and to an increasing extent customer ownership has been encouraged. The American Telephone and Telegraph Company advertises that it has 420,000 stockholders.

2—These numerous investors represent a more permanent interest and one that *demands more careful and considerate handling*

than would a few large stockholders playing the game of high finance. They have more votes.

3—The leading corporations have grown so large that the individual interest of a personal proprietor has been all but lost. The management is divided and delegated among a large number of presidents, vice presidents, etc., who receive salaries and who have little or no direct opportunity to share in the profits of the enterprise. Big business is coming to be run as governments should be run and even to show some of the wastes of government operation. This condition releases the profits of enterprise to the body of stockholders to an extent never possible before.

4—At the same time, the net earnings available for dividends have become more certain and stable. A surprisingly large number of companies have adopted the policy of accumulating large surpluses in fat periods. Such companies often retire bonds and preferred stocks, or make additions to plant out of earnings. Integration and diversification of industry have rapidly increased so that most large companies are less subject to the exigencies of a single trade.

5—Governmental and private regulations, together with enlightened self interest, have brought considerable improvement in the conduct of corporate affairs and stock market operations, though neither is perfect.

6—The increasing information through “services” and the press, though liable to abuse, both proves the widespread interest in stocks, and offers to small stockholders in convenient form a means to direct their investments that is superior to that possessed in past years by even the “insiders”.

The cumulative effect of all these factors has been to place a large number of leading stocks on a higher level of values than ever before, and above all to insure a fair degree of stability for such values. The market perhaps has become less sensitive in anticipating or even in reacting to minor changes in business, and, during the past two or three years of transition to a new and higher basis of values, it has been slow to respond to unfavorable factors; but, if due allowance be made for money conditions and interest rates, it appears to have reflected rather accurately the many complex elements that form the whole business situation.

ON THE COMFORT OF CUSSING

BY E. MACLEAN JOHNSON

Now as every one familiar with the art can attest, there are two kinds of cussing. Or rather there is one brand, pure and unadulterated swearing; and a spurious variety, popularly styled swearing by the ignorant, which in truth is nothing but vulgar profanity.

The man who really cusses does so from the fullness of his heart. It is the profane man who perverts swear words from their legitimate function as a vent for overcharged emotions, and uses them to embellish his conversation. He is chiefly responsible for the stigma of reproach that attaches to the practice. "The soldier, full of strange oaths and bearded like the pard," the boisterous reveller, the swaggering fool—these are the ones that have corrupted swearing, and thrown an ancient custom into ill repute. Such misuse of swearing is a most offensive form of slang. It is the sign of paucity of thought and vulgarity of mind.

No one with red blood in his veins needs a definition of real swearing or an explanation of the purpose which it serves. To him the distinction between the true and false is obvious. And yet an eminent divine once declared in all seriousness that the only reason men swear is to emphasize their veracity! What surprising limitation of experience, what narrowness of emotional range, that remark betrays! How could a normal individual have lived in this workaday world and reached a ripe old age with such opinions!

One can but wonder whether the worthy gentleman ever trod on a banana peel when garbed in his Sabbath best; or smashed his finger driving nails; or barked his shins at night on an obtrusive chair. Or did he always submit to the petty plagues of life with unruffled composure, and say, "Amen!" for instance, when his collar button rolled down his back? But whatever the attitude of clergymen may be, the average mortal on such occasions

is certainly more concerned with emphasizing his emotions than his veracity.

The practice of swearing is hoary with antiquity. From the earliest days of which we have knowledge, men have resorted to this method of relief. In all probability it dates from our first ancestor. Sacred history, it is true, does not tell us that Adam, when evicted without notice, varied his conjugal reproaches with a few vigorous invectives. In the absence of direct evidence to the contrary, however, we are safe in assuming it as plausible. The wrath of Achilles would lose half its potency if we omitted the oath by which he seals it. Nor were the valiant men of Rome behind their Grecian neighbors: "Lars Porsena of Clusium, by the nine gods he swore." From Homer's day to the present, the great heroes of fiction have seldom hesitated to express their feelings forcefully when occasion demanded it.

Shakespeare's men are conspicuous for the vigor and picturesqueness of their oaths. Falstaff takes the lead; but he has many competitors. Hotspur, Prince Hal, Macbeth, the noble Hamlet—it is easy to multiply examples. Indeed, it would be hard to find a Shakespearean hero without a fiery expletive. Even the ladies swear. "Swear me, Kate, a good, mouth-filling oath," would imply that Hotspur's better half was familiar with the gentle art. "Out, damned spot!" by Lady Macbeth hardly surprises us; as it is quite in keeping with the lady's forceful character. But we do confess a start at, "ancient damnation!" from the rosy lips of Juliet.

In more recent Ibsen days, there is Nora stifling in her doll's house; then suddenly finding her soul and rising to woman's estate with three poignant little words: "How I should like to say, '— — —!'" She says it, and the way to freedom opens. This, and not the slamming door, is the symbol of her spiritual awakening. How many other Noras of the past might have found themselves had they dared to challenge convention with the magic of that same emancipating phrase!

Nor should we overlook among the heroes of fiction the redoubtable Captain Corcoran, R.N., of Her Majesty's Ship *Pinafore*:

Bad language or abuse
I never, never use.
Whatever the emergency,
Though, "Bother it!" I may
Occasionally say,
I never use a big, big D!

Crew—What, never?
Captain—No, never!
Crew—Wha-at, never?
Captain—Well, hardly ever,
I hardly ever use a big, big D!

For a genuine connoisseur in the art of swearing, there is the father of Tristram Shandy:

Small curses, Dr. Slop, upon great occasions are but so much waste of our strength and soul's health. . . . They serve to stir the humors, but carry off none of their acrimony. . . . For my part I seldom swear or curse at all . . . but if I fall into it by surprise, I generally retain so much presence of mind as to make it answer my purpose; that is, I swear on till I find myself easy.

Mr. Shandy, being the soul of modesty, would doubtless disclaim this tribute as belonging more fittingly to the learned Ernulphus, whom he credits with establishing an institute of swearing, and whose ability he describes in glowing terms:

There is an Orientality in his (swearing) we can not rise up to; besides he is more copious in his invention—possessed more of the excellencies of a swearer. . . . 'Tis true, there is something of hardness in his manner; and as with Michael Angelo, a want of grace; but then there is such a greatness of gusto!

Washington has gone down in history as the Father of his Country. He is entitled, however, to further distinction as one of the world's great swearers. What General in any land or age has won a tribute comparable to that paid Washington by one of the officers on his staff?

It was at Monmouth on a day that would have made any man swear. Sir, on that day he swore till the leaves shook on the trees! Admirable! Charming! Never before or since have I had the pleasure of listening to such swearing! Sir, on that ever memorable day, he swore like an angel from Heaven!

Small wonder a man endowed with such genius could well nigh work miracles!

Many a milder man has found consolation and courage in cussing. Even the gentle Field admits the comforting delight it brings:

I am so vilely prone to sin,
Vain ribald that I am;
I'd take a heinous pleasure in
Just one prodigious damn!

In its mechanism swearing is analogous to the locomotive blowing off steam. It relieves a high-pressure tension in the human engine; and often averts what might otherwise be a serious explosion. If Rip Van Winkle's wife had permitted herself a few vigorous invectives at the New England peddler who roused her ire, she might have lived to greet her devoted spouse when he returned from his nap in the Catskills.

The man who swears has a genial, open nature. The milk of human kindness has not curdled in his veins. He does not cherish resentment; but disposes of his irritation in a flash, and at once is at peace with the world. It is those who are denied this wholesome outlet for their feelings who become embittered, pessimistic, and revengeful.

Childhood memories bring up a vivid picture of my Uncle David. How eloquently he could swear! He was past master of the art. I have never met a man with such a picturesque vocabulary of cuss words. It was a joy to listen to him when he was in full blast. He was always tremendously in earnest when he swore. No one who ever heard him could for a moment question his sincerity. As a youngster I delighted in his fiery eloquence; partly because of the rich pungency of the language he employed, and partly because I knew it meant safety for myself. No matter how villainous a trick I was guilty of, if I could only keep out of Uncle David's reach until he had freed his mind completely in his favorite method, I was immune.

What a contrast was Aunt Nancy! She never swore. And that, I think, accounted for her remorselessness. It mattered not how long I evaded her. It made no difference how many interruptions came between. The minister's wife might call; or the cat might have a fit. When the excitement was over, Aunt Nancy was ready for me; and not a whit of her resentment had

evaporated. The longer it was bottled up, the more it fermented. Ah, if she had not denied herself the comfort of cussing, how different might be my remembrance of her!

The passions of those who will not swear sour within them and poison the very springs of their nature. The diabolical disposition of our Puritan forefathers is directly ascribable to the fact that they dammed the natural channels of their feelings. Instead of getting rid of their cussedness, they kept it stored up within themselves. Hence their gloomy faces, their crabbed outlook upon life, their kill-joy practices. The stocks, the ducking stool, the whipping post—these were the devious ways through which their thwarted emotions sought expression. How much kindlier to have burned a little brimstone than to have roasted witches!¹

Honest swearing is healthful exercise. It is tonic for irritable nerves. Doubtless much of the nagging and nervousness ascribed to the gentler sex has been due to the uncharitable convention of the past which excluded them from the benefits of this wholesome practice. One of the most human men I ever met said he loved to swear before clergymen because he knew it pleased the poor things. They couldn't swear themselves; but they did enjoy hearing a few good cuss words. I have no doubt the same generous impulse animated him in the presence of ladies; for he had the reputation of "swearing most awfully" on occasions.

Real swearing is a badge of sincerity. In this world of conventions where everyone wears a mask, and where language "exists to conceal thought", it is a relief to hear an honest if forceful expression of opinion. I was walking in the residential section of the city on a winter morning after a storm of sleet had left a slippery glaze on door stones and pavement. A faultlessly groomed young man came out of one of the houses. His limousine was waiting at the curb. He swung a walking stick in one hand and held his gloves in the other. His face was correctly expressionless as he started jauntily down the steps with superb indifference to their icy coating. Just as I got opposite, and just as he was half way down, his feet shot out from under him, and he sprawled ignominiously on his back. His face kindled with

¹Of course, as a matter of fact the witches were hanged, not burned; but legend is so much more interesting than history!

genuine emotion as he picked himself up and said—well, just what you or I would have said or wanted to say under the circumstances. And he said it with so much feeling, with such absolute sincerity, that I longed to shake hands with him on the spot.

Swearing is the nearest approach we have to a universal language. All races and ages understand it. Witness the ease with which children acquire the words. There is a natural eloquence about swearing that is not gained in schools. This is attested by the fluency with which many an unlettered man can swear. That he can swear beautifully is excellent proof how necessary is emotion to effective expression. It is only the cultured man, however, who can swear in seven different languages. That is the real bliss. One who knows the classic art of swearing is lifted above vulgarity. Still, there are compensations for the others. It is cited on good authority that the ease with which one swears in English is what has made it the great commercial language of the world.

Some well-intentioned but misguided persons have suggested the substitution of harmless invectives in place of the recognized cuss words. For instance, when a man loses his temper, let him exclaim: "Bats and Black Beetles!" or, "Cats and Kingfishers!" instead of—Oh, never mind what. Such reasoning shows a lamentable lack of acquaintance with the art of swearing and its underlying psychology.

It is just because it is the thing forbidden that swearing is effective. Were it not taboo, it would fail to give relief. A former acquaintance was a trifle hot-headed and addicted to strong language under provocation. Invariably after he had indulged in a few bright colored expressions, he would become contrite, and ask pardon with all humility. I never dared to tell him how much I enjoyed his swearing lest it should spoil the wholesome effect of his mortification. For it is from that swearing derives its benefit.

We have run ourself out of breath only to see our train vanishing around the curve. We have dropped our watch and smashed the crystal the morning we got it from the jeweller. Our new Panama on the first day's wearing has blown into the gutter, and

a dog has worried it. Wrath at the inspired perversity of all animate and inanimate things surges over us. One recourse alone is left us. If we are powerless to cope with an inconsiderate world, we can at least shock it. So we swear. Out of the depths of our nature, from the innermost springs of our being, pour the comforting cuss words. We are doing the wicked thing, the forbidden thing; and we exult in our depravity. We glow with the consciousness of our iniquity until we glow with shame at our folly. The last emotion blots out the others and dies in effacing them. Love of our fellow mortals once more animates us; and we are at peace with mankind.

For those denied this soothing method of relief, what depths of torment wait! Picture the horror of going through life with unutterable emotions raging within one! It is the agony of the giants pinned under Ætna and consumed with slow fires; of Prometheus with the vulture tearing at his vitals; of Vathek with the flaming heart!

What harsher punishment than to be condemned to an impotent and inarticulate existence! These are the unfortunates that need our sympathy. May we not be pardoned if we shed a friendly tear and say:

Alas! for those who never swear,
But die with all their cussing in them!

AUSTRALIA'S WASHINGTON

BY SIR JAMES ELDER

TWENTY-SEVEN years ago the Duke of York, now George V, King of Great Britain, Emperor of India and of the British Dominions, came to Australia, and there proclaimed to the world the birth of the Commonwealth. In the same year he opened in Sydney the first Federal Parliament. The Australian poet, Roderick Quinn, sang thus of the event:

We sent a word across the seas that said:
"The house is finished, and the doors are wide;
Come, enter in!

"A stately house it is, with tables spread,
Where men in liberty and love abide,
With hearts akin.

"Behold, how high our hands have lifted it!
The soil it stands upon is pure and sweet,
As are our skies.

"A People's House, a People's Home,
Enisled in foam and far apart;
A People's House, where all may roam
The many rooms and be at ease;

"A People's House, with tower and dome;
And over all a People's Flag—
A Flag upon the breeze."

The House is indeed built, the Australian "bush capital" has been established.

On May 10 of last year, King George's second son, the present Duke of York, performed a similar service at Canberra, the new Federal Capital of Australia. On that day the inauguration of the new city was accomplished, when Mr. Bruce, the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth, handed the keys of Parliament House to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Duke of York from the portico of Parliament House said: "Today is the end of an epoch and the beginning of another." The first epoch to which he referred was the period of time that had elapsed since his father, twenty-six years before, had inaugurated the Commonwealth of Australia. The other is the future history of Australia, which its citizens hope will add its quota to the advancement of civilization.

Australia has "grown up", and on May 10 last celebrated her baptism as a member of the world's nations. In perfect Australian highland weather this historic ceremonial was performed. Brilliant sunshine succeeded a night of frost. Many thousands of Australians had gathered at Canberra, among the gum-tree covered hills, most of them camping in tents, provided by the Federal Territory Commission, alongside their motor cars, for hotel accommodation in Canberra, limited at the best, was naturally incapable of taking care of the great concourse which had gathered to witness an event of unsurpassed importance to Australia. In a striking Empire pageant, staged in perfect surroundings, the ceremony was carried out. Many nations were represented, as was also the entire political and social life of the Commonwealth.

One cannot but reflect on the similarity of the circumstances of the inauguration of Washington, D. C., and the opening of Canberra, bearing in mind the great space of time that has elapsed, and the enormous advance of transportation facilities that has taken place since the former was proclaimed the new Capital city of the United States of America. The ubiquitous motor car played a great part in the bringing of the people to the ceremony at Canberra. Roads in Australia today, though not yet of the best, are naturally greatly superior to the highways of America in those remoter days. The time that was occupied in traveling from one end of the States to the other was very great, and the hardships of the traveler were many. A journey of this kind was a serious undertaking. Today in the United States and in the Commonwealth railroads and highways permit of travel in ease and comfort from one end of each Continent to the other.

What a contrast today between the Washington of the last decade of the Eighteenth Century and the Washington of 1927!

But the great scheme was there all the time, and the original idea is being accomplished. A stately and beautiful city has grown up, and is every year becoming more impressive and imposing.

By comparison, Canberra has made a promising beginning. Ample funds have been placed at the disposal of the Commission which controls and directs the activities of the Federal Capital Territory and the Capital itself. An international competition for a design of the city was held, which was won by an American architect, Walter Burley Griffin, of Chicago. This design is the ground work of the layout of the Capital, and it is obvious that the influence of Washington was impressed in the architect's mind and memory when his plans were being prepared.

The seat of Government of the Commonwealth of Australia was fixed by the Constitution Act of 1900, which was passed by the six States of the Commonwealth. This Act provided that the Federal Territory was to be in New South Wales, not less than one hundred miles from Sydney. This provision was arrived at by compromise among the States and settled the competing claims for the situation of the Capital site. After much investigation and discussion between the Federal Government and the Government of the State of New South Wales, and after inspection of many sites in that State by Commissions and Parliamentary Committees, extending over a period of years, Canberra was finally selected, and the Territory was bought from New South Wales and vested in the Commonwealth on and from January 1, 1910. The total area is about nine hundred square miles (576,000 acres). The land set aside for the Capital Site itself is twelve square miles (7,680 acres), and after reserving a further 100,000 acres for public buildings, military college, reserves, parks and roads, there remain 360,000 acres for productive purposes. Canberra is situated in latitude $35^{\circ} 15' S.$ and longitude $149^{\circ} 15' E.$, and is seventy-five miles in a direct line from the eastern coast of Australia. It is 204 miles from Sydney, and 429 miles from Melbourne. The Territory ranges from 1800 feet to 2600 feet above sea level.

The Commonwealth Government also bought from New South Wales an area of twenty-eight square miles (17,920 acres) at Jervis Bay on the east coast, almost due east from Canberra, for

future possible use as the port of the Capital City. Here, the Royal Australian Naval College has already been established. Jervis Bay is about one hundred miles distant from Canberra.

Railway communication between Canberra and the New South Wales Government Railways system has been established. Parliamentary and Executive buildings have been erected. A house has been built and equipped for the supply of electric light and power. Owing to the large expenditure incurred by Australia in the Great War, works of an important character, monumental and ornamental, have been deferred, so that such buildings as Parliament House and the Executive Offices, while substantial, convenient, and suitable for the work of Parliament and Government, are strictly utilitarian and are of a provisional character. There are ample telephone and telegraph facilities. A Government Printing Office has been built and fire services established. The Government has also erected three hotels, as also many houses of an attractive design for civil servants. Avenues and streets have been made, and shade trees planted. Several bridges have had to be put up, the most important of which is that over the Murrumbidgee River where it joins the Cotter. Shrubberies and public gardens have been laid out, and belts of trees for protection and shelter have been planted. Recreation grounds, naturally, have not been overlooked, and all sports and games can be indulged in. An afforestation scheme enables the Commission to determine the most suitable trees for purposes utilitarian and decorative. Canberra is destined to become one of the most beautiful and attractive of the Capital cities of the World.

Australia is a natural and vigorous branch of the parent oak, left to grow as Nature intended it, and bearing its leaves and its acorns of its own impulse. No restraining bands have impeded the action of its vital growth. The parent tree did not attempt to dictate the shape in which its young branch would grow, but left it to choose its own form, and thus the new Commonwealth spreads and enlarges, unhindered and untrammelled. With Great Britain and the United States as examples, Australia has founded her institutions and moulded her future on the highest ideals of these countries.

In size, Australia is slightly larger than the United States of

America. The Federal Territory in which Canberra, the new Capital, is situated is remote from the Capital cities of the various States of the Commonwealth. While this remoteness, mayhap, has disadvantages, so far as distance is concerned, it will in the course of time prove of great benefit to the Commonwealth, as has Washington to the United States of America. Federal authority will be able to function in a calm and placid atmosphere, separated and apart from powerful State interests, and will thus be able to render true service to Australia.

And so Australia has proclaimed to the world her baptism as a nation! I am certain that from my experience as Commissioner for Australia in the United States of America this event will have been received in that country with expressions of the most cordial character. For in that great democracy no people are better regarded and more highly esteemed than are Australians, and the progress of the Commonwealth, as marked by this latest historic milestone, will be heartily applauded throughout the length and breadth of that country. Australia's continued progress is what America desires, not for any selfish reason on her part, but because of the fact that Americans look upon us as people like unto themselves, whose aims, ambitions, and history are those of the grand pioneers who established themselves on the east coast of the North American Continent, and to whom in the largest measure can the greatness of the United States be ascribed. Australia will fulfil her destiny. She is to become a great Nation, not merely in view of her size, but because of her great potential wealth, her unbounded resources, and the quality of her citizens. While she is taking as a pattern the centuries old British rules of law and conduct, she is not unheeding of the lessons which the history and progress of America have taught.

America and Australia are peopled by men and women whom fortune placed on virgin soil to work out a common destiny, each designed to become a mighty nation, steadfast and secure on its own sound foundation. Australians and Americans have many points of similarity, as has also the history of the two countries. Both have the same pioneer blood, and both have descended from those venturesome spirits who went far afield in the world in their search for greater opportunity and for greater freedom, with the

resolute determination to obtain better conditions of living, and to establish for themselves new democracies, founded on the highest and best traditions of their common ancestral race.

The fact that the United States and three great units of the British Empire—the Dominion of Canada, the Dominion of New Zealand, and the Commonwealth of Australia—are the only white countries in the Pacific, makes the bond of kinship and friendship all the closer. Australia has no quarrel with any of her other neighbors; she has no wish other than that she should continue on terms of friendship with all. Since our history began we have lived at peace and amity with all. Our associations with other countries outside the Empire, however, cannot ever be so intimate as with our own kith and kin, who speak our common language and enjoy a similar civilization. Therefore, the progress of Australia has a deep and significant meaning to the people of the United States of America, who we know are our friends, and who desire in every way to promote our welfare.

During the Great War, a close bond of friendship was formed between the American and the Australian soldiers. The men of the two great democracies in the Pacific, the United States of America in the North and the young Commonwealth of Australia in the South, fought side by side, and that acid test constituted the beginning of a real and intimate knowledge of each other, a knowledge which is broadening and deepening as the years advance, and which is being nurtured and sweetened by the closer intercourse between the two countries. Australia's association with America from the beginning has been a history of friendship and goodwill and the two nations have thus a solid basis for the foundation of a great and lasting union. The venue of the destinies of the world is in the very nature of things bound to change, and the Pacific is becoming more and more the stadium where the changing histories of the world are being made. I have steadfast hope and faith in the candid and abiding friendship between America and our Empire in a mutual attitude of peaceful endeavor for the good of each and of mankind.

FARM PRICES AND THE VALUE OF GOLD

BY JOHN R. COMMONS

Professor in the University of Wisconsin

II

IN the January number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW a comparison was made of the stabilization of values of manufactured goods and non-agricultural raw materials, compared with the relatively large fluctuations of values of agricultural products, especially cotton and wheat. These were connected with the changes in the value of gold as expressed in the familiar "index number" of prices, and with the operation of the Federal Reserve System in regulating the value of gold. The comparisons there made have a bearing upon various remedies proposed for the restoration of farmers' prices.

The McNary-Haugen bill, adopted by Congress, but vetoed by the President, proposed to furnish to the farmers an offset for the protective tariff furnished to the manufacturers. The proposition went so far only as to provide a means of taking care of seasonal and periodic depressions of prices by enabling farmers to warehouse their crops and hold them off the American market while selling the surplus, if necessary, on the foreign markets. It provided a mechanism which would give an effect similar to that of the stabilizing practices of manufacturers previously mentioned. The difference between the two classes is that the manufacturer stops production when his prices start to fall, but the farmer cannot stop the bounty of nature that depresses his prices. He was to be provided with a means to warehouse the surplus until nature turned niggardly and raised prices. So far the proposition falls in with the modern ideas of "orderly marketing". Its success depends on the administrative ability and the disinterested knowledge of economic forces on the part of the appointees to the Board charged with the administration of the act. For it is a remedy that must be considered with reference to other

causes of depression and prosperity, one of which is the value of gold on the world's markets.

In 1921 the world's cotton crop fell off one-fourth but the price did not rise—it fell one-half. In 1924 the world's cotton crop increased 62 per cent. over 1921, but the price did not fall—it increased 35 per cent. The thing that depressed the farmer in 1921 and prospered him in 1924 was the change in the value of gold, which more than overcame both the short crop of 1921 and the large crop of 1924. A McNary-Haugen law, administered without knowledge of these facts, would collapse. A similar depression of prices occurred in 1925 and 1926 when the value of gold increased, but the manufacturer now had learned, with the help of the tariff, to stabilize prices, and farmers had not learned how and did not have the help of government.

This suggests another proposed remedy, a reduction of the tariff. This would operate in two directions for the benefit of the farmers. It would increase the foreign demand for products which the farmer sells, and would reduce the prices of manufactured goods which the farmer buys. A lower tariff would enable Europeans to send to us more of their manufactures, which would create an increased foreign demand for the farmers' exports of foodstuffs and raw material, and compel American manufacturers to reduce the prices of things the farmers buy. A lower American tariff would help to feed and clothe impoverished and unemployed Europe, whose very impoverishment and unemployment are an important cause of the American farmers' reduced markets.

This remedy is important enough, in so far as it might reduce the extravagances of the Fordney tariff, behind which American manufacturers can maintain high prices through their live-and-let-live policies. But no reduction would be of any avail if there should occur a corresponding rise in the value of gold. If, for example, the tariff should be so reduced as to let in an additional billion dollars' worth of imports from Europe, at prices, say, ten per cent. lower than those now charged by American manufacturers, and if, at the same time, the world's price level were reduced ten per cent. by increasing the value of gold (which is about what it was reduced during 1925 and 1926), then the additional

gold value of the given quantity of imports from Europe would be \$900,000,000 instead of one billion dollars, a shortage of ten per cent. in the gold value of the imports. Thus the European *gold* demand for American exports would be reduced by increasing the value of gold to the same extent as the European *commodity* demand for American exports was increased by reducing the tariff. Europe could not get the benefit of the tariff reduction measured in gold, and, for the same reason, American farmers could not get the benefit of the higher prices expected from reduction of the tariff.

Of course, it might be said that the farmer would gain because all prices would be reduced, both agricultural and manufactured, so that his crops would buy just as much manufactured goods on a low level of all prices as on a high level of all prices. Whether the value of gold were high with low prices of commodities, or the value of gold were low with high prices of commodities, would make no difference in the quantity of manufactured goods exchanged for a given quantity of crops.

This answer is mathematically correct, but economically incorrect. The same quantity of business can, of course, be conducted on a low level of prices, such as that preceding the war, as on the high level of prices following the war. If all prices are marked up or marked down alike, there is no difference whatever in the real value of any commodity, measured by its power to command other commodities in exchange. But the answer is not economically sound, because it fails to consider taxes, debts, and the unequal effects on industry and agriculture brought about by *changes* in the value of gold.

Debts are not marked up or down when the value of gold goes down or up. Debts are promises to pay, not a fixed quantity of commodities, but a fixed quantity of gold, or what the creditor is willing to accept as its equivalent, without regard to any change in the value of the gold itself. Post-war taxes, too, are largely taxes to pay public debts. Debts and interest rates incurred at the high level of prices in 1920 required twice as much cotton to pay them in 1921 and two-thirds more wheat in 1923.

On the other hand, debts and interest incurred in 1921 required only three-fourths as much cotton to pay them in 1924 as would

have been required in 1921, and only three-fourths to two-thirds as much wheat to pay them in 1924 and 1925 as would have been required in 1923. Furthermore, our system of general property taxes, instead of income taxes, means that the farmers' taxes on land do not diminish promptly when his net income diminishes by changes in prices of his crops. Finally, as we have seen, changes in the value of gold affect agricultural prices more violently than they affect non-agricultural prices.

It is on account of taxes, interest, debts and the violence of agricultural price changes that farmers need both stabilization of the value of money and "orderly marketing" of crops; for it is not the high or low value of gold in itself that hurts the farmer. Changes from a high to a low value demoralize him, or from a low to a high value damage him. If the change is from high to low value of gold, the farmer, on account of increased prices, becomes over-optimistic, and incurs larger debts than other industries in order to carry on the same amount of business as he did at the previously lower prices and the lower values of land. And if the change occurs from a low to a high value of gold, the burden of debts and taxes is increased more by falling prices than it is for other industries, which are able to stabilize. He loses by the rising overhead charges when prices rise and he loses by the fixed charges of debts and taxes when prices drop. All industries lose in the same way, but the farmer loses more than others because his price changes are more violent and he cannot so easily escape their consequences.

It is likewise the rise in the value of gold that reduces Europe's ability to pay its debts and to increase its demand for American export. Europe's war debts should be distinguished from Europe's business debts. American private investors have loaned to national and local Governments and to private corporations of Europe several billion dollars during the last five years. In nearly all cases these loans were used to enlarge or restore the productive machinery of Europe. Like all productive loans, they are based on the expectation that the new improvements will so increase the productivity of labor and industry, at the same or higher level of prices, that the borrower will not only be able to pay the interest and principal in gold or equivalent credit, but

will also have a larger product for better wages, more employment and larger profits. These productive loans of over six billion dollars therefore, assuming that prices do not decline, increased the ability of Europeans to produce more wealth, enlarge their exports and thereby enlarge their gold demand for American exports.

The war debts acted in the opposite direction. They reduced Europe's ability to purchase goods from America. What America sends to Europe, in exchange for her payments of interest and principal, is not food and clothing; we send simply a receipt for gold. And these war debts did not help Europe to increase her production of wealth; what she borrowed was American war material at high prices used in the process of destroying the means of production, whether factories, farms, or men.

I am discussing this matter, not from the point of view of sentiment, gratitude, revenge, or fidelity to contracts, but solely with respect to the economic effect on farmers' prices and on the quantities of our exports. With the debt settlements effected and in contemplation, the payments to America will run \$250,000,000 yearly for sixty years. The American farmer stands to lose much more than that amount as a result of their payment.

The debts are to be paid in gold dollars. But in order to get the gold the Europeans must sell their products to Americans, or to other foreigners who in turn send their goods to America. We prohibit by our tariff too much selling to us, especially if the sellers cut their prices in order to sell. But Europeans *must* cut prices if they are going to force their exports upon the rest of the world in order to buy gold at its increased value with which to pay America. They must sell to countries like Brazil and Japan, and thus get possession of the debts that American importers of coffee and silk have promised to pay in gold to Brazil or Japan. The Governments of Europe, by means of taxes, can then buy these gold debts owed by Americans to Brazil or Japan, paying for them by debts owed by Brazil or Japan to their own exporters, which the Governments have bought with the proceeds of taxes from those exporters. Thus, by setting off one debt against another, they pay to America in foreign exchange what they owe to America in gold.

But to do so not only must they tax their people in order to buy the foreign debts owing to their own exporters, and thus reduce the buying power of their people for American foodstuffs and cotton, but their own exporters must also reduce the gold prices, not merely of the small part of those exports needed to buy the \$250,000,000 in gold owing to America, but of all their exports. This reduction in prices is itself an increase in the value of gold and thus reduces the gold buying power of their export commodities in American and other markets. If, then, the value of gold increases through the policy of the Federal Reserve System, the European debts increase also, the prices of European exports decline, the quantities of commodities they must export in order to pay the American debts in gold is increased, and they have less money with which to buy American farm exports.

Because of this situation, Europe has had to obtain buying power in another direction—American loans to Europe. These have taken the two forms of bank credits and investments. The bank credit period was the disastrous period of inflation and deflation beginning in 1919 and ending in 1920. B. M. Anderson, Jr., economist for the Chase National Bank, figured this out in the latter part of 1920. During the nineteen months from January, 1919, to September, 1920, the excess of our commodity exports to Europe over imports was \$6,600,000,000. In the first half of 1919 this was paid for largely by loans of the American Government to European Governments. These loans were used by Europeans to buy our exports. But the American Government ceased making advances after April, 1919, and American bank credit took its place. American producers and exporters were selling to Europe in unprecedented quantities at high prices. American banks enabled Europe to carry this load by the creation of new credit at low rates of rediscount by the Federal Reserve banks. During fifteen months, to September, 1920, this short time debt of Europe to America, used to pay for American exports, was increased by the amount of \$3,772,400,000. This increase was largely financed by the member banks of the Federal Reserve System at low rates of rediscount. The banks also loaned to Americans, not exporters, on similar favorable terms.

Hence the demand liabilities of the Reserve banks were in-

creased until their lawful minimum gold reserve was nearly reached. Then the Reserve System began to increase its rediscount rates and to discriminate against bank loans designed to increase the volume of short time debts to Europe. The collapse came in the middle of 1920, when the rediscount rate was raised to seven per cent. in New York. Europe, without American credit, could no longer buy American exports. As a result the general level of prices of commodities fell in all parts of the world, beginning in Japan, which sells about eighty per cent. of her raw silk to America. Also in America, as in Japan, the greatest fall was in agricultural prices, these being our main exports. Japanese raw silk had been bought at high prices and stored up in large quantities by American importers, financed by abundance of bank credit at low rates of discount. When the discount rates were raised, this silk was forced out of its hiding places into the markets, and the price of silk collapsed. The world panic of 1920 did not start in Japan, as is often said; it started in America. Similar things happened to American farm prices. Europe, during these months, had not been paying for American farm products by increasing her exports to America and the world; she was paying by excessive loans of American banks to American producers and exporters, at low rates of interest and rediscount, on the security largely of debts owed by Europeans to Americans for American exports.

The second stage of paying for American exports by means of increasing Europe's debts to America began in 1921, and the movement is now in full swing. This time the payments are made, not by means of American bank credit, but by means of American investments. The first period was the short period of short time debts financed by banks. The second is the longer period of long time debts, financed by American investors. Warnings are already uttered by American bankers. Will Europe be able to pay interest and principal in gold on these long time debts? They have been accumulating until, with the war debts, they amount to about \$22,000,000,000. The net amount may be less; but if it is only one-half of this amount, can Europe increase her sales in foreign markets without cutting prices in order to make her increased productivity count in gold dollars?

It is estimated now that foreign countries are under obligation to pay about \$1,000,000,000 annually, in gold or its equivalent credit, to America on account of war debts and private debts. Hence, it is not merely a question of increasing Europe's productivity by increasing her equipment of machinery and improvements; it is a question of how Europe can maintain its buying power in gold without cutting prices in terms of gold. If this buying power is not maintained, it will be the American farmer with his exports who will suffer most, as he did in 1921. If the farmer's prosperity depends on American willingness to lend to Europe, it can continue only while the willingness continues. People can always pay high prices for large quantities of goods by going in debt either to bankers or to investors. They cannot pay prices as high nor buy quantities as great when they must sell commodities for gold instead of credit, in order to get the money to buy the goods, and especially when the value of gold itself is increasing and the prices of their export commodities are falling.

The situation turns on the relation between gold, bank credits payable in gold, and goods. The whole world must sell its goods at diminishing prices and in increasing quantities in order to buy a billion dollars of gold or gold credits annually to be delivered in America, over and above the quantities needed to exchange for American exports. The first notable result is the accumulation of the world's gold in the vaults of the American Treasury and Federal Reserve banks. We now have more than half of the world's monetary gold, about twice as much as is needed to serve as legal reserve for the existing volume of notes and commercial bank credit used as money. The problem of how to prevent that gold from becoming available to banks for increasing the volume of commercial bank credit has been the high problem thrust upon the Federal Reserve System.

In 1919-20 they permitted the gold to become available. The volume of rediscounting by member banks was allowed to increase at low rates, until the gold reserve almost reached the legal minimum of forty per cent. There was then the evident fact that the world was short of commodities, and hence it appeared that it was the demand for commodities that was sending up world prices. The banks, it was claimed, were only following the de-

mands of business when they increased the supply of bank credit to meet the demand. But this was only one-half of the story. The discovery was soon made that it was not only a world shortage of commodities that sent up world prices in 1919-20; it was equally an expansion of American bank credit, created, in part, to enable Europeans to buy goods, that furnished the amount of purchasing power needed in order to support the high prices. This bank credit had been created by member banks rediscounting commercial loans at Federal Reserve banks at as low as four per cent., which was a low rate at that time. In effect, member banks were borrowing the use of gold from the Reserve banks at four per cent. and relending to business customers at five and six per cent. This continued until the end of 1919 and into 1920.

Then the Federal Reserve banks began to raise the rediscount rates. Too late it was discovered that the world demand for commodities and the world supply of commodities were only half of the forces at work in raising prices. The other half was the increase of bank credit. The American Reserve System had obtained control of the world's gold supply, and American private bankers were borrowing the use of Federal Reserve credit and turning it over, multiplied possibly ten-fold, to American business men, secured by European promises to pay.

The financial administrators of the System had not learned how to prevent either the scarcity of commodities or the increase of bank credit from inflating world prices. They explained the rise of prices as due to a world shortage of goods destroyed by war. The other side of their explanation should have been that there was an augmented supply of bank credit to support the increase of prices, because there was no effective limit on the amount that member banks could borrow at Reserve banks and relend in ten times the quantity to business customers. Shortly after the banks stopped the increase of Reserve credit by charging seven per cent. for rediscount in May, 1920, instead of four per cent. the year before, the inflation not only stopped but turned to deflation. Soon their impounded gold was eighty per cent., instead of forty per cent., of their demand liabilities, because the quantity of their deposit and note liabilities had been reduced and the quantity of gold had been increased.

What happened then and since is control of the world's monetary gold supply by the Federal Reserve System. This control is becoming more pronounced on account of the increasing need of Europe to buy and deliver gold or its equivalent to the American Government and to American investors and exporters in payment of debts and purchase of American goods. The gold imported cannot serve as money until it first gets into the Federal Reserve banks and then is loaned to member banks, mainly on the security of their customers' commercial paper. Thus, by controlling the world's monetary gold supply, the Federal Reserve banks regulate the value of that gold, just as any great organization controlling the bulk of the supply of any product regulates its value, whether it be diamonds, steel, coal or gold. By making gold less valuable, as in 1919-20, when they loaned a huge credit-equivalent to the banks at four per cent., world prices were increased. By making gold more valuable, as in 1920-21, when they curtailed these loans to member banks by charging high rates of interest and otherwise, world prices were made to decline.

Since that time of 1921, when a million farmers are said to have lost their farms and five million men were out of work, the Reserve System has learned much about controlling the value of gold. But this learning has not yet extended to the general public. Again explanations are given for the fall in prices since 1925, similar to the explanations given for the rise in 1919. It is now a world surplus of goods which is said to have caused falling prices, especially of agricultural products, as it was then said to be a world shortage of goods that caused rising prices. Here, again, only one-half the story is told. There are, indeed, as we have seen, wide fluctuations in the *volume* of crops. But the *values* of the crops do not respond, because there are also changes in the value of gold, through which the crops are converted into other commodities.

In view of these considerations another proposed remedy for agricultural distress may be given its proper setting. The American farmer, it is said, is not entitled to "relief" because he is ignorant and inefficient. He should do what manufacturing industry has done. During the past few years almost the greatest increase in manufacturing efficiency ever known has

been accomplished. This accounts, it is said, for falling prices of manufactures. Seven years ago it required one man three days to make an automobile tire. Now it requires one man one day. Efficiency in this case has increased two hundred per cent. in six years. This may be extreme, but many manufacturing corporations show increases in efficiency of fifty to one hundred per cent. during this period. The average increase is thought by the Federal Reserve Board to be about ten per cent., which is about equal to the average fall in prices. Otherwise with the farmer. He is said to be inefficient.

I am assured by agricultural scientists that the farmer has about as good a distribution of efficiency as business men. But supposing he does not, what is implied by this comparison of business and agricultural efficiency? The implication is that there are too many farmers; that the one-family "dirt farmer" must go; that farmers must become wage-earners, employed by large farming corporations under scientific management, which will then regulate the production of farm crops, as modern manufacturers have learned to regulate the output of manufactured products. It is not surprising that farmers resent this programme, which is quite the Communistic prediction of Karl Marx.

It may be held that this is what we are coming to; but before we yield to it we should look at other reasons additional to efficiency for the greater prosperity of manufacturers. This prosperity has occurred even though the prices of manufactured goods have been slowly declining during the past two years (Chart II, January number of *THE REVIEW*). Increased efficiency accounts for a part of these increased profits at lower prices, but it is the greater fall in the prices of agricultural products that accounts for another part of it. In 1920 and 1921 prices of agricultural products fell much more than did prices of manufactured products. This enabled manufacturers to recover by buying raw material at lower prices without reducing their own prices. Something similar happened in 1925-26. Hence, we have the contrast, on the one side of unprecedented prosperity for manufacturers, surplus capital loaned to Europe and high wages for industrial workers, while on the other side are abandoned farms, low agri-

cultural wages, an increased burden of farm taxes and debts caused by the fall of agricultural prices, and a falling off in agricultural demand for manufactures. Before we attribute the farmers' fate to inefficiency and the manufacturers' prosperity to efficiency, we should examine the fall in Europe's buying power, the rise in the value of gold, the violence of changes in farmers' prices, and the stabilization of output and prices by manufacturers.

The same argument of inefficiency is made against Europe's manufacturing industries. It is said, if they would only be as efficient as Americans, they could recover prosperity. But suppose their efficiency increases twenty-five per cent., and at the same time their export prices fall twenty per cent. Then all of their increased efficiency is taken away from them by the increased value of gold. In truth, neither American farmers nor European manufacturers can fairly be charged with inefficiency if the gains of their efficiency are quietly abstracted from them by this rise in the value of gold.

From what has been said it is evident that another remedy proposed by certain spokesmen of the farmers, namely, general and permanent reduction in the rates of interest and bank discount, is fallacious. Changes in the rate of rediscount, along with open market operations, are the very means by which the Federal Reserve System controls the value of gold and the level of prices. We cannot have *both* a stable value of gold *and* a stable rate of discount. We can have only *either* one *or* the other, not both together. The changes in the rate of discount and the open market operations are like the control levers of an automobile. Selling securities and raising the rate tend to stop inflation or to cause deflation of prices; buying securities and lowering the rate tend to prevent deflation or to aid inflation. If these are done at the right time, in the right magnitude, and at the right place, always in anticipation and not too late, then the average of prices is stabilized by stabilizing the value of gold.

Along with this mistaken proposal of continuous low rates of interest and rediscount is the contradictory criticism that the Reserve System promotes Wall Street speculation in stocks when it reduces the rate of rediscount. Undoubtedly a reduction in

discount rates may cause stocks to rise in price. In the order of sequence it seems that changes in discount rates generally show their effects first in the stock markets, then in wholesale commodity markets, then in retail prices and wages, and lastly in rents and real estate. This sequence is not always the same, but the stock market usually is first affected because it is the place where future profits and losses cast their shadows before. Indeed, Messrs. Owen and Hardy have shown, upon the basis of extensive investigation, that changes in short time and call money rates of interest have less effect on prices of stocks than do such things as expected corporate earnings, the hope of increased dividends and the general temper of the speculative community. It is evident, too, that a large part of these expected profits or losses, affecting all industries alike, arise from an expected general rise or fall of commodity prices. Stock price movements are mainly the result of individual forecasts of two things: commodity prices and the volume of trade.

It is relatively unimportant, therefore, to try to prevent that incidental effect on stock speculation caused by changing the rates of rediscount. The important thing is the stabilization of commodity prices, and this the Federal Reserve System can assist by lowering the rates of rediscount and buying securities to prevent deflation of prices, and raising the rates and selling securities to prevent inflation. The effectiveness of such action depends on whether the change in rediscount rates is made early enough and uniform throughout the country. A lowering of the rate in New York without lowering it in the agricultural districts may possibly encourage a rise in the price of stocks and thus discriminate in favor of stock speculation.

All important are the "right time, right magnitude, and right place", above mentioned. The word, *Timeliness*, expresses it. Sometimes the Federal Reserve authorities must work *with* forces which they cannot control; sometimes *against* forces which they cannot control. Their decisions depend upon the administrative ability and legal authority of the Federal Reserve Board and Federal Reserve banks. They require in their great task the highest technical ability known to modern business; and in their organization there should be proper representation of the agricul-

tural, commercial and banking interests, in order to avoid discrimination. No praise too high can be awarded to the Reserve System for the quality of its economic technique since 1923, in using the great powers granted to it by Congress. The matter in question is only, "What shall be the standard of public policy they use in exercising their legal powers and managerial ability?"

Congress has given to them as a System authority for concerted action which enables them, as has been explained, to control the value of gold and the general level of world prices, but Congress has laid down no policy except the vague "accommodation of business and commerce", thus putting on the Federal Reserve authorities the unfair responsibility of using their uninstructed and private judgment as to what is needed by, and desirable for, the country from time to time. This omission has already caused a division within the System, as to whether the rate of rediscount should be uniformly lowered in order to help Europe buy American farm exports, or kept at a higher rate to aid the bankers in making profits. Had Congress retained the clause of the first draft of the Federal Reserve bill, which would have instructed the System to maintain stability of the general price level, the wholesome effect of a definitely known policy might have been enjoyed. Even the extreme fluctuation of 1919 and 1920 might have been avoided by stopping inflation sooner and making the deflation less severe, just as afterward a price inflation was stopped in 1923 and a price deflation was controlled in 1925.

Having this great economic power of both inflation and deflation of prices, the public questions involved are: Shall stabilization of the value of gold be adopted as the legal standard? And, at what level of commodity prices in general shall the stabilization proceed? Since these are matters of opinion, I can only offer my own suggestion that stabilization of the value of gold should be made the legal aim of the System, and that the general price level should be maintained at about the level of 1923, when prices in general were sixty per cent. above the pre-war level. This would be fair to Europe, whose war debts were settled when prices stood at about that level, and would be fair for American manufacturers, public utilities, wage earners and farmers, who have made their readjustments largely on that level of prices.

This does not mean that stabilization of the value of gold would of itself change the spread between industrial prices and agricultural prices, or be a panacea for farm problems; but it would reduce the violence of future changes in the spread. A stable value of gold is merely stability of the *average* of all prices, and does not necessarily modify the ups and downs between *particular* prices which make up the average. The changes of particular prices have other causes peculiar to each commodity, and these changes are going on and will continue even if the average does not change. The tariff, debt payments, stabilization of manufactures, disorderly marketing in agriculture, as well as many other causes affecting the supply of, or the demand for, particular commodities, would continue to operate on particular prices irrespective of any gold stabilization. Each of these causes must be dealt with separately and on its own merits. Tariff reduction would help the farmers; war debt cancellation would help them; coöperative marketing would help; the McNary-Haugen bill would help; but all of these are inadequate because their results can be nullified unless the Federal Reserve System stabilizes the value of gold.

It is not only the spread between manufacturers' prices and agricultural prices that burdens the farmer; it is also the spread between his prices of former years and his prices now, resulting in an increase in the burden of taxes and debts occasioned by the fall in prices. The public debt, National, State and local, was about ten billion dollars in 1912, and sixty billion in 1922, an increase from \$18 per capita to \$203 per capita. The total private indebtedness is not as accurately known, but it has doubtless increased. Certainly farm indebtedness has greatly increased. The total American annual taxes—National, State and local—were about two billions before the war and are seven billions since the war. Taxes and interest on debts must be paid in gold or its equivalent, and, in order to get the gold, commodities must be sold. If the level of prices falls twenty per cent.,—that is, from 100 to 80,—then the quantity of commodities that must be sold for gold or gold credit, in order to pay a given amount of interest and taxes, must increase twenty-five per cent.—that is, from 80 to 100. The farmer's burden of taxes and debts has been increased

both by the *larger amount* of taxes and debts payable in money, and by the larger amount of commodities required to be sold in order to pay the *same amount* of taxes and debts.

In this respect the farmer suffers with others, but he is in a less advantageous position to adjust his affairs to meet the new conditions. The issue is a general one and resolves itself into the question, shall creditors obtain unearned income in terms of commodities, and producers suffer undeserved outgo in terms of commodities, by a mere rise in the value of gold, over which they have no control and over which only the Federal Reserve System has control? Or, reversely, shall creditors be made to lose and debtors be presented with a gain by a fall in the value of gold, over which they have no control? A stable value of gold, regulated by the Federal Reserve System is the most important of the many things required in preventing the ups and downs of production and employment in all lines and maintaining a better balance between manufactures and agriculture.

It is also necessary for the Federal Reserve System itself, as being the main thing which will keep underhand politics out of the Federal Reserve Board. For, if a public policy of price stabilization is acknowledged and required, then the criterion needed for selection of members of the Board is not their views on public policy, but their administrative ability.

THE JOY OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY

BY THE REV. DR. JAMES HENRY DARLINGTON

Bishop of Harrisburg

*Onward, Christian soldiers,
Marching as to war,
With the Cross of Jesus
Going on before.*

THIS, the first quatrain of one of the Church's most familiar hymns, shows the Christian ideal which is for all, clerical and lay; the following and uplifting of Christ's Cross. If this is true of the laity, how much more should it express the ideas and ideals of the clergy, the chosen and ordained leaders of congregations of Christians!

If I should write, from forty-five years' experience in the ministry, after my ordination in 1882, that there are no crosses in that calling, I would not be telling the whole truth; and yet I wish to state, as the summing up of my life's experience in Holy Orders, that the joys of the ministry are much more than its sorrows, and that its happiness is a continual blessing. On the whole, the ministers I know are the most cheerful class in the community. The promise to Godliness, of long life in this world and eternal life hereafter, still holds good. If anyone doubts whether the life hereafter makes ample rewards for any privations here, it may not be possible to convince such a one; but as to the long earthly life of parsons, I can only refer fellow students of my old college of Princeton, to the Rev. Alfred B. Baker, D.D., ex-Rector of Trinity Church there, now nearly a centenarian, and call the attention of college men to the fact that at their college reunions, when the oldest living alumnus is called to rise, nine times out of ten it is a clergyman, and not a merchant, or soldier, or sailor, or any professional man.

My arguments range themselves in this order:

1—It is a mentally stimulating life. There is considerable study to be done, with varied reading; and a clergyman keeps up

with all secular knowledge, the leading reviews, as well as the strictly religious magazines and the contemporary developments in theology.

2—It is physically attractive, because a part of nearly every day should be given to calling in the homes of parishioners, which means the exercise of walking from house to house, climbing stairways to invalids and the aged, and in the country means owning and using a motor car, so that one is kept in God's out-of-doors by the needs of his work.

3—It is spiritually helpful. A clergyman, by preaching sermons to increase the faith of others, takes these reasons to his own heart, and, with soul at rest, has few spiritual worries.

4—It is a prayerful life, in which the clergyman cultivates dependence upon his Divine Master and Best Friend, so that whatever discomfort may threaten, his mind and soul are not disturbed, and his nerves are at rest.

5—It is an independent life, when one can rise at any hour one pleases and retire at such time as he deems best; when days in the middle of the week can be used and taken for any desirable trip or purpose, and one is not confined to a small, stuffy office for eight hours, six days in each week.

6—It is an honored calling, so that a clergyman, his wife and his children are universally respected and esteemed, and great deference is paid to his words on civic and social affairs, as well as to his Sunday discourses.

7—It is a fairly well paid calling. In fact, the minimum salary in most dioceses is \$2,000 or more, and a comfortable home; making the net salary about \$3,000.

8—It has permanence of tenure. A clergyman in the Episcopal Church is *called for life* on good behavior and, under ordinary circumstances, with faithful work there is always a majority in each congregation who will vote to sustain the pastor against opposition, should any members of the vestry or other prominent individuals try to force him to resign. Very few clergymen are asked to resign unless there is good cause for the request. As to clergymen changing parishes often, almost all the removals of which I have been cognizant have been made by those who, on account of health or for some other reason, desired to go to

another part of the country, or perhaps were promised \$1,000 or \$2,000 more salary, which they wished to use in paying the college expenses of their children. Short pastorates are due largely to clergymen wishing to leave for what seem good and sufficient reasons to themselves, and the congregations generally part with them with regret. The last three clergymen at whose funerals I have been called to officiate recently were—one who had been thirty-four years in his charge; the next had been twenty-six years, and the reason he left his church then was to take a higher executive position; the third had been twenty-two years with his church, after coming to us from the Presbyterians. Several clergymen have left the diocese this year, but only because they wished, and for some reason preferred another charge which called them.

9—The clergy are exempt from being drafted for war, although many of them bravely in the late World Conflict chose to volunteer. A discount of ten per cent. is generally allowed them on clothing, books and some other merchandise they buy, and they travel on half fare on the railroads by securing a clerical order.

10—They are so favored by the kindly attention of wealthy and leading parishioners that their children enter the highest social life, and a census shows that listed among prominent Americans in *Who's Who* there are more clergymen's sons and daughters who have distinguished themselves, than the children of any other class in the community.

There are, of course, a few people in every congregation who are inclined to find fault, but kindly and careful criticism does harm to no one. The clergyman is rightly looked up to as an example on account of his superior education, and the respect shown him should be as grateful as it is deserved.

11—Some clergymen do manage, by economy and careful planning, to save money. They have invested their small savings sanely and with foresight, and a number have grown fairly well-to-do financially before old age. Through the kindness of financial leaders, who are on their church boards, the clergy are often advised to make certain low-priced investments, and years afterward find that, through following this wise counsel, they are in very comfortable circumstances.

A leading layman told me recently that he thought "the clergy were the bravest of men" when they undertook the responsibility of marrying and bringing up a family on the small stipends paid to country parsons. Not all country clergymen, however, are to be pitied, as in the case of one clergyman, called to a church on Long Island, this last year, who was promised \$6,500 a year, while his congregation paid for and gave him a fine limousine, and his large rectory with its spacious grounds, light, heat and telephone; making this country rector's salary (a man aged about 35) at least \$10,000 a year. This, you may say, is exceptional; but with due economy I see no reason why all clergymen in the United States should not save something from their income against a rainy day, and invest it so as to provide greater comforts in old age.

12—The Church Pension Fund, with eighteen million dollars of assets, rapidly increasing at the rate of about half a million a year, now pays but \$600 to \$800, but when it is a little larger, every clergyman is to receive, when he retires at 68, one-half the average salary he has been paid all his life, and so the clergy who have received \$5,000—that is \$4,000 and a parsonage—will get about \$50 a week automatically. These premiums are not paid by the parson himself, but by the church for him. There is no reason why he should not take out in addition a good endowment life insurance policy in some reliable company, so that when this term of ten or twenty years runs out, he will have sufficient income to live without receiving any salary. A clergyman's widow receives a check for \$1,000 immediately after his death, and the children, if there are any, and it is needed, receive monthly payments from the Church Pension Fund until they are twenty-one years of age.

13—The great joy of the ministry, however, has nothing to do with its financial compensations; these should be sufficient to keep the clergyman from worry as to food and raiment and the education of his children, but his great compensation is the fact that his life work is to make bad men and women good, and through his prayers, his preaching, his advice, and, most of all, his consistent example, he is "to allure to brighter worlds and lead the way". He needs all the ability and brain power that he

can possibly have to meet the many problems, of family and business affairs, which will be brought to him to settle by his advice. His congregation know that he has ability, that he has good judgment, that he cannot be bought, and that his counsel can be had "without money and without price", and therefore, when he has been in charge of a parish for some years, he has more power than any judge upon the bench, or any president or instructor of a college.

It is a great responsibility and a great honor to be the parson (or person) of the whole village or town, over which he has been placed by God's providence. I would advise any young man who feels called of God to preach the Gospel and wishes to do good, to enter the ministry without hesitation, and feel sure that he and his will never regret his choice.

Of course, the appreciation of spiritual values and the call to this highest life of inspiration, responsibility and self sacrifice, will be heard and answered only by those who have the spirit of knighthood in their breasts and are willing to dare and do all things, to save their fellow men and make this world a better place in which to dwell. My three sons are clergymen, and I think they have chosen the happiest life on earth.

Years ago I wrote, in verse, my view of the pastor's life, with which I will close this article:

AMBASSADOR OF CHRIST¹

When a youth is seeking counsel to make best use of his life,
 And also asking God's direction on his bended knees,
 For a life that's noble, rather than career of selfish ease,
 And would rather die in battle than, ignoble, flee from strife,
 Prizing praise of conscience more than wealth of future child or wife;
 There's only one great calling which will then his soul appease;
 To serve Christ as a clergyman, will give him all of these,
 To hold and teach a loving faith, though unbelief is rife.
 As Christ was Prophet, Priest and King, so is His loyal priest.
 Ambassador of God's own Son, there's naught can him appall,
 In pulpit preaching, giving alms, or at altar's sacred feast.
 When listening, praying people to their Heavenly Maker call,
 He represents the King of Kings, himself least of the least;
 Higher than proud earthly rulers, he's more honored than them all.

¹ From *Verses by the Way*, Series 3.

THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

BY C. G. ABBOT

(The best blood of England flows in my veins; on my father's side I am a Northumberland, on my mother's I am related to kings; but it avails me not. My name shall live in the memory of man when the titles of the Northumberlands and the Percys are extinct and forgotten.

—JAMES SMITHSON.)

EIGHTY years ago American science cut but a sorry figure in the world. A few giants there were, isolated, impoverished, struggling against the indifference of a populace absorbed in wresting a living from a virgin land. Natural science was not taught in any of our colleges till 1802. A few feeble societies fostered research—cups bailing the ocean. Government neither recognized the importance of, nor believed it had the right to support, research. And yet, here was a vast, untouched continent, combining in a single geographical and political unit a complete book of natural history, with a wealth of minerals and oil, of plant and animal life; peopled by a primitive race, illustrating the mode of life and habits of thought of prehistoric man, and offering an invaluable key to the lost story of man's climb upward. At the same time, here was an energetic people, unhampered by tradition, possessed of the mechanical tools capable of developing this new continent. It was an unparalleled opportunity for the increase of knowledge.

It was also a crucial moment. Suppose the energetic men remained blind to the possibilities and wasted the continent for practical ends before its perishable secrets could be gleaned! What was needed was some powerful inspiring force, actuated by the highest ideal of knowledge for its own sake, realizing the possibilities, and able to organize American science to make the most of them.

That force the liberality of an Englishman supplied. For America owes the Smithsonian Institution, her national scientific institution, to a citizen of another land. His name was James

Smithson. He was a son of the Duke of Northumberland, and a descendant through his mother of King Henry VII. But he devoted his own life to science, and when he died in 1829, he left his fortune of \$541,000, conditional on the death of his nephew without heirs, to the United States to found "an establishment for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men."

From that bequest sprang the Smithsonian Institution. Congress insured it prestige and stability by accepting the trusteeship and establishing a governing body of Regents composed of the Vice President, the Chief Justice, three Senators, three Representatives and six private citizens. The Regents insured the usefulness and high character of its activity by putting the administration in the hands of the foremost physicist of America. And Providence, I suppose, may be thanked that that foremost physicist was Joseph Henry. For Henry saw eighty years ago as well as we do now what the need of the country in science was, and he had the ability to make the Smithsonian fulfill that need.

Under Henry the Smithsonian became the rallying center of American science. He made it the spur of research and the printing press for the diffusion of results. In the first place it offered American investigators for the first time an agency for the publication without cost to them of their work. As a result, within three years Henry could report: "The real working men in the line of original research hail this part of the plan as a new era in the history of American science."

As a second step, the Smithsonian organized investigations on a scale too great for any other existing agency to attempt. For example, in those days no Weather Bureau existed; its value was not recognized. The Smithsonian organized a continent-wide body of volunteer observers, numbering as high as six hundred in some years, supplied them instruments, and reduced and published their results. For twenty-two years the Institution maintained this organization, until the Government could no longer doubt the public importance of such work and organized the Weather Bureau.

In the third place, the Smithsonian seized the opportunity of the opening West. To the boundary surveys, the military ex-

peditions, the railroad surveys, the Institution supplied instruments and men to determine magnetic declinations, to collect plants, animals and minerals, to study geology and the customs and languages of the Indians. It received and studied the collections made, and published the results. Out of this work were graduated in time the United States Geological Survey, the National Museum, and the Bureau of American Ethnology, the last two of which are still administered by the Smithsonian.

Thus at a time when statesmen's political consciences forbade them to support scientific work, the Smithsonian provided an agency for initiating and carrying on the work until its proved practical value removed any doubt of the duty of Congress to support it. In this way the Institution also created the Fish Commission and supplied the first Commissioner in the person of its second Secretary, Spencer F. Baird.

As a fourth step in spurring science, the Smithsonian made itself the cavalry of science to bring aid to neglected fields. Vital contributions were made, here to botany, there to paleontology, to astronomy, to entomology; life was infused into stagnant regions of science, and new sciences, such as oölogy and paleogeography, were created.

Working along such lines as these, the Smithsonian has in eighty years achieved far-reaching results. Directly out of its work ten Government bureaus have sprung, seven of which are still administered by the Institution. It has created the International Exchange Bureau, which perhaps more than any other one thing has mobilized the scientists of the world into a single army. It rescued aviation from ridicule, created America's leading scientific library, built up the most extensive and valuable collection in American natural history in existence, has taken part in some 1,500 expeditions covering the globe, has coöperated with and aided every scientific or educational institution of note in this country and abroad, has served as the link between American and world science, and has given to American science a high and generous ideal.

And what the Smithsonian has been it still is. At the present moment in so far as its limited income will permit, it is carrying on investigations in three continents on solar radiation which

give promise of making possible long-range weather forecasting; it is furnishing the basic information on plants, insects, and animals which enable the economic bureaus of the Government and private activities such as agriculture and fisheries to function most effectively. It was Smithsonian research on Smithsonian collections of sea bottom samples which produced the knowledge by which oil companies of the Southwest are enabled to stop the costly sinking of dry holes and thus save millions of dollars.

In the light of these facts the Smithsonian stands out as the coördinator and inspirer of American science, as what Mr. Hoover has called "peculiarly the architect of scientific investigation in our country". It has competed with none, but consciously sought to inspire and coöperate with all. And as in the past, so in the future there exists for the Institution a field of activity in which there are no competitors. There exists a category of tasks which its position, relation to the Government, international reputation, and wide scope supremely fit it to perform.

THE GENTLEMEN WITH THE LAMP

BY MARY DAY WINN

MANY years ago I happened to be with a friend in a moment of terrible revelation; tragedy, for a minute, drew back the screen and I saw her naked soul. It was for me a shattering experience. Today naked souls are being exposed all around me and nobody quivers an eyelid. Lady Godiva rides down every street, more or less clothed bodily, but in a mental nudity far more revealing. Peeping Tom no longer hides behind the shutter. He has a college degree, an office, and a consultation room. He records in solemn-looking books what he has seen, and attends annual conventions to discuss methods of improving his eyesight.

It is appalling. Restraint and the concealing of emotions, at least in public, have long been the hallmarks of breeding and indispensable in the technique of the diplomat. The man or woman whose opponent in the game of society, war or politics knows exactly what he is thinking, is defenceless as an unwallled city.

Consequently we have been accustomed, in the past, whenever we felt a disarming emotion stirring within us, to draw an expressionless curtain over our features. Today the man or woman who tries this in the presence of a psychoanalyst discovers that the curtain of inscrutability, like the imaginary clothes which the fairy tale king thought he was wearing, is the merest mosquito netting, so far as concealment goes. She finds that she is not only living, mentally, in a glass house, but that the house seems to be studded with signposts telling the most casual reader of Freud in exactly what room she happens to be at the moment and where she is going next. Those sessions *in camera* when she used to gaze, fearfully but secretly, at her own inhibitions, are now open to the public, and the only ticket of admission required is a copy of the *General Introduction to Psychoanalysis*.

When I was a child, one of my favorite stories began, "Once

upon a time there was a king who had three daughters. The youngest and most beautiful was named Psyche." This young lady, who was of course the heroine, was as inquisitive as she was fair. Wedded to Love, and living in a beautiful palace where she was fed and cared for by unseen hands, thus escaping at once the servant problem and the high cost of living, she still was not happy. Love came to her only under the veil of darkness, and had made her promise never to try to see him. But she wanted to know what manner of creature he really was. She felt she could not rest until she knew all his secrets. So one evening, when Love was sleeping beside her in the decent privacy of the dark, Psyche lit a lamp. . . .

The author of this story should be ranked with the Major Prophets. We are living today in the terrible fulfilment of his vision. Psychiatry, the youngest daughter of Materia Medica, has lit a lamp, and with its mental X-rays is pursuing her investigations, not only into the nature of love, but into the nature of everything and everybody else around her. Like the person who has become possessed of a pot of gilt, and can never content himself with the particular piece of work he started out to do, but must needs gild everything in sight, Psychiatry carries her little lamp, like a miner, always on her head—and privacy has gone from the world. Emerson advised each one of us to retire, at intervals, to the mountains of our own spiritual isolation; but those mountains have been leveled now. The public highway crisscrosses the spot where they stood.

To admit to a psychiatrist, and especially to a psychoanalyst, that you like or dislike anything under the sun, even spinach, is to strip the mental clothes from your back; to tell him that dream you have had so often of going into a small, dark room, is suicidal. Never confess to a fondness for tall candles or chewing gum; as soon as you do so you realize from the expression on his face that someone has blundered and has, like the Light Brigade, rushed on to destruction. The someone who has exposed the secrets of your soul is your "subconscious"—or "unconscious", whichever it happens to be the fashion of the moment to call that informer within the gates, who, like the Biblical spy in Jericho, seems most at home in the house of the harlot.

If it were simply a question of exposing our thoughts by our speech, however guarded, there might be some hope of preserving the privacy of our souls, for speech is voluntary. But the psychiatrists do not need speech or facial expression to tell them what we are really thinking underneath the mask we present to the world. They have invented a little machine which will measure emotion to the fraction of a degree by recording variations in the heartbeat. If the man who is in love with his neighbor's wife, but has honorably determined never to let it be known, should be unwise enough to allow this little instrument to be strapped to his arm, and the object of his secret devotion unexpectedly entered the room, the telltale record would confound him, with a result which might change the pattern of three lives.

If I did not believe that the gentlemen with the lamp had the detective ability, or at least a goodly portion of it, that they claim, I should not be so alarmed for my privacy. No one feels embarrassed in the presence of a crystal gazer or an astrologer; their character reading is just a shrewd expression of the obvious. But these scientific fortune tellers have a way of ferreting out just the things you hope are *not* obvious.

A certain psychiatrist was asked, during the war, to examine the men in officers' training camps and report any mental or character deficiencies which would make them unable to stand up under the responsibility and strain of war. At one of the camps which he visited, the commander expressed some scepticism of his ability to size up men after a few moments' conversation; so the doctor proposed a test: "Line up your candidates for commissions," he said. (There were about one hundred and fifty.) "I will go down the line, talk with each for a few moments, and then make a list of those who will not, I think, make good officers. At the same time, have the men who are training them, who know them, and have had a chance to watch them for several weeks, go into a tent and make out a list themselves of the recruits who are not promising material, who are slow to respond to orders, lacking in initiative, don't coördinate, can't get along with the others. Then we will compare the two lists and see how well they agree." The challenge was accepted and the men lined up. When he had talked to each and drawn up

his report, the psychiatrist had thirty-three soldiers on his list of the unfit. Comparison showed that twenty-nine of these men were also on the lists made out by their superiors. One fine looking man on the doctor's list, who was nevertheless later commissioned and sent to the front, collapsed the first time he was ordered over the top.

In the face of second sight like this, what chance has anyone of concealing his mental weakness or depravity?

I earnestly hope that I shall never live to see the day when Freud can be bought at the Five and Ten Cent Store, and everything that each one of us thinks and feels is known to all the rest. Let the scientific gentlemen have their little lamps for scientific use, but let them not be manufactured in quantity. Such a state of things would take much of the fine flavor out of life. The game of living would be as dull as those terrible games of bridge when you are teaching your opponents to play, and they lay their hands down before you and say, "Now what would you bid on this?"

All social intercourse is based on polite deceptions. Business is based on deceptions not so polite, and derives its zest from each man's ability to outguess his fellows. Without deception, pride and self respect would crumble. My dull old friends invite me, on the first of June, to a Labor Day house party; "So long in advance, so that we'll be sure to get you." I smilingly accept, making a mental note that I have done my good deed early to-day. If they could look into my heart, as a psychiatrist probably could, and see the black murder there, they would be hurt as I never intended or wished that they should. I doubt if human beings could live together if they knew everything about each other. If there is one thing most of us learn early in life, it is that disastrous consequences often follow a game of "truth". Truth lives, according to legend, at the bottom of a well, and has formerly been, thank goodness, quite a home body.

Lovers, I think, would suffer the most if the knowledge of psychoanalysis became universal. Then, if ever, we are entitled to our illusions. When He tells Her that she is the only woman he has ever loved, she prefers to stifle commonsense and all she has learned about the nature of love, and believe him. The

roseate vision which he has in his mind of her, and which is the real object of his love, is probably far from being a picture of the actual woman; it may coincide with reality in nothing but the shape of the ears. But he will find this out soon enough; she does not want psychoanalysis to provide him with glasses.

The spread of this science presents another disturbing possibility. Will those who want to commit evil deeds, and have been restrained only by public opinion, now go ahead and commit them, feeling that in their neighbors' knowledge of their dark designs they are damned anyway? I was taught that what really mattered in the sight of God was not what you did but what you thought about it. I accepted this teaching theoretically; in actual practice I have counted myself a good woman because, though I may have wanted my troublesome old aunt to die, I have never made any deliberate effort to kill her, and nobody knows that I am at heart a murderess. I retain my church membership and the respect of the community, as does also the husband of my acquaintance who is always showering his plain little wife with flowers and candy. But now that all my friends are becoming psychoanalysts, this man's winning attentiveness will soon be revealed as merely a "defence mechanism" to hide the fact that his affections have strayed from the lawful sharer of his income; and I myself shall be exposed as a would-be murderer. With murder becoming so popular and so lucrative nowadays, who can feel sure that I may not be impelled to live up to what is expected of me—a Playgirl of the Western World?

Even when I do or say a noble thing—or what I used to think was noble—I no longer derive much satisfaction from it, thanks to psychoanalysis. When I hear that my best friend covets the Presidency for which I was planning to run myself, I step out of the race with a beautiful gesture of renunciation. In the days before Freud, this act would have given me a thrill greater than being President. But I can no longer deceive myself; plainly I have an inferiority complex, and in my secret soul fear that I would never have been elected anyhow. Psychoanalysis has taken from me even my "delusions of grandeur".

“MORITURI——!”

BY ALBERT PAYSON TERHUNE

AN eternal procession of us is moving outward, sometimes swiftly, oftener with a hesitance that irritates those who tread on our heels. A like procession, springier of step and clearer of eye, presses forward to seize upon our uncooled places. So ever it has been. So ever it must be until the Day when at once both processions shall be swept off the Board.

We oldsters make up the recessant group; we who have passed, or are nearing, the half-century mark. Our glowing successors—Youth—form the on-pressing army. When a class is graduated, one of its members counsels the remaining classes, in a valedictory. When a tenant moves from a house, he tells the newcomer what he can of the house's faults and virtues.

I am appointing myself, herewith, a Valedictorian—a soon-to-be evicted tenant, if you youngsters prefer—and I am going to say a few dull things about your own Youth and of the Youth that was ours.

No, it is not going to be a snarling invective of the Younger Generation. (I am not of the throng that declares we have slumped from the Mid-Victorian to the Mid-Vulgarian Era.)

I

To begin with, you Nineteen-Twenty-Eighters have a host of things which we had not, at your age—things not then invented and other things not then dared. We grant that; we semi-centenarians. But, we had a few things which you have lost or which never have been yours and never can be. Some thirty years ago, we would have gasped incredulously over wonders which are everyday commonplaces to you—the things you have which we hadn't. Take one illustration:

Last evening, you and a patently respectable girl of your ac-

quaintance went to any one of six plays that are current in New York. If you had a car of your own, you went in it. Otherwise, you took a taxi. From the theatre, you and she went to a night club; perhaps a mildly decorous one. There, you ate and drank and danced. You deposited her on her doorstep, sometime after 2 A.M.; perhaps some hours after. Not a thrilling evening in any way; nor out of the usual run. Yet, thirty years ago you could have done not one of the things you did last night. Naturally, you could not have been carried to and fro in your own motor or in a taxi. For there were no such vehicles. You must needs have worn evening clothes and high hat; not a comfortable dinner jacket and soft headgear. You could not have taken the “patently respectable girl” alone to theatre or to supper, if you were not engaged to her. A chaperon—almost as extinct now as the four-wheeler you would have ridden in—would have been as inevitable a feature of the evening as were your trousers. You could not have taken the girl to any of those six most-talked-of plays. For thirty years ago, not one of them would have been permitted to raise its curtain in any American city. No, I don’t mean, of necessity, that you took her to one of the law-banned dramas of the past season; but to some popular production of much lingual frankness.

You would not have taken her to a night club; because there was no such thing as a night club then. Nor would you have danced with her at any after-theatre resort; because at decent after-theatre restaurants the patrons did not dance. As for having a few drinks with her or offering her a cigarette in a public place—you would no more have done either of those things than you would have drawn a pistol on her. In that day, young girls of good families did not drink. If they did, it was in strict privacy and not with men. Some of them smoked. But no restaurant would have tolerated it. You would not have brought her home at 2 A.M. or later; unless from some severely decorous dance; and then only with a sleepy chaperon to see that all was well.

Your Saturday half-holiday—those of you who are at work—is as much of an institution as your workless Sunday. You can spend it in motoring or in golf. There is at least one country club within easy reach of you. Also, somehow or other, most of you

seem able to wrangle a day-off, every now and then, from your offices. Many of you find time to run down to Florida for a month in winter.

The foregoing paragraphs are stuffed full of envy. I envy you from the core of my antique soul. In my own youth, the Saturday half-holiday was a dissolute innovation, frowned on by nine-tenths of the business world. Not one man in thirty knew, from experience, what it could mean. (Nor did we go to pieces from overwork, any oftener than do you.) There was not one country club where now there are a hundred; and there was none which did not involve a somewhat long train ride to and fro. Golf was in its American infancy. Few and oft-ridiculed were its devotees. Motoring was unborn. As for days off, they were pitifully few and hard to win. Florida was a name, to most of us; not a resort. A month's vacation in winter? No excuse short of tuberculosis availed to secure such a divine loafing-spell.

But all these blessings which are yours and which never were ours, are as nothing compared to a Something that has come into the world for you alone, since our time. I am speaking of a queer new Freedom, which three decades ago would have been branded as delirious license, if indeed it had existed then; a Freedom which is your own and never was ours.

Take clothes, for one illustration; clothes, both men's and women's. Men are spared the tombstone-slabbed stiff white shirt for everyday wear, with its horrible detachable stiff cuffs and its vexation of studs. The first shirts which unbuttoned, coatlike, instead of coming off and on, scratchily, over the owner's head, were just creeping shyly into favor in 1900. Nor need men wear heavy and hard derby hats for weekdays and shinily uncomfortable silk hats for Sundays and for evenings, as did we. Soft collars and soft shirts were unknown, for city use, when we were young.

Girls, too, have no idea of their own sartorial good luck; in going corsetless and in wearing skirts short enough and wide enough for free strides. Women, of my own youth, were frowned on for suggesting daringly that an ankle-length skirt be worn in rainy weather. A band of brave spirits banded together in the late 'Nineties, and formed a "Rainy Day Club", for the wearing of this brazen type of skirt. But nothing came of it, ex-

cept a little frowning and much derision. Yes, in clothes, your freedom is sublime. That is not irony, but honest approval.

You have also a frankness of language which, in my day, was heard oftener in barroom than in drawing room. Some of your physical poses and some of your wholly unashamed actions would have banned you forever, then. Where, for one instance, is the 1928 maiden whose cheeks would flame in dire humiliation for the sins of her skirts, if the latter were whisked so high by a vagrant gale that a whole inch of the leg, north of the kneecap, were visible? In her calm disregard for such a zephyric mishap, Kay 1928 is far sensibler and no less modest than was the painfully embarrassed Kathryn 1898.

II

And now that I have cited a smattering of the myriad points wherein you excel us, let me play for the attention of my fellow oldsters by telling you about some of the very few things we ancients had which you have not and which never can you hope to have.

First, and most carnal, comes eating. You present day lads and lasses don't know how to eat. At least, you don't know how to *dine*. There was a dignified and dilatory epicurean enjoyment about the nine-course to eleven-course dinner party of thirty-odd years ago that is forever dead. The feast was not gross, nor was it haphazard. It was planned as a symphony is planned. It worked up to its climax and then down to its “walnuts and wine” with unflawed artistry. It was something to look forward to and to remember for weeks. Hostess after hostess won immortality because of her inspired chef and because of her own genius for food-marshaling. It was a beautiful art, this dinner-giving.

You, of today, bolt a bobtailed and garbled evening meal, at smart pace, in order to get to the theatre or the opera in time to disturb those who were there at the rise of the curtain. Or, you plow through a little more leisurely and better-appointed dinner, with an eye to getting away from the dining-table and to the card table or to the dance floor. In other words, dinner is but a detail of your evening; not its chief end.

I wonder how many of you moderns could sketch a correct (not necessarily genius-directed) dinner of ten courses; working up to the needful crescendo and down. How many of you could tell, offhand, precisely which wine goes, gastronomically, with which course; the exact temperature for the burgundy; why pale sherry should be served instead of sweet, and at what particular stage of the dinner; the scientific reason for a mid-meal sherbet, and why sherbet always should be served between which two other courses; what forms of game should be blood-rare and what well done?

Your ideal dinner-party, now, as a rule, is preceded by enough crude cocktails to scourge tired brains into activity. The food courses are whittled down to five or six, at most; and are eaten dry or with incongruous and off-key accompaniment of too much low-grade liquor.

Eating and drinking are the more tangible, but otherwise the least important, of the few things we had and that you have not. There was an indefinable Manner—a something bred of fine reticences and of innate courtesy—that lent beauty to much of the social intercourse between men and women, and which in its olden form I can find no longer. I can no more put it into actual words than I can verbalize the dawn-wind. But many another man or woman of my day will recall it and will feel an odd little heart-constriction at the sweet memory. Perhaps you have something better in its stead. Assuredly you have not the quality itself. It was bred of Leisure—for ours was a leisurely age, though we called ourselves hustlers. It was born, too, of a somewhat shopworn remnant of ancient Chivalry. Some of us did not possess it. But it was the attribute of many folk of breeding.

I have said ours was a leisurely age. Perforce, it was so. Speed does not beget the instruments of speed; but is begotten of them. Speed did not devise the motor. But, as soon as the instrument was at hand, the joggingly pleasant Sunday afternoon drives or strolls through shade-flecked country roads gave frightened place to a mile-a-minute roaring progress over concrete highways and between tourist-desecrated wildwoods. With the invention of the various instruments for speed—real and figurative—the Speed Age dawned. It is a right marvelous era. I admit that. But among the things it has slain were a few which

could not be spared. One of them was a greater leisure for certain fine things of life; such as the best manners of the late Nineteenth Century.

Perhaps Chivalry is well dead. I cannot argue the precise value of its ghost that walked wistfully through the 'Nineties. But I refuse to grant that Leisure is well dead. We had it, in fair quantity; though by no means to the degree that was our fathers', in the stagecoach and sailing-ship age. You have practically none of it; in spite of your Saturday half-holidays and your long vacations. They are not periods of true Leisure, those absences from work. For the most part, they are but a breathless form of one or another kind of hustling activity.

You may know how to *loaf*; you don't know how to *loiter*. Loitering was wellnigh as fine an art as eating. It went out when Home ceased to be the center of life's chiefest importance and happiness.

We who are about to die away from the coveted spotlight into the murk of later years, salute you. I have tried to voice this salutation; if stammeringly; and to show you what you have that we had not and the little handful of wondrous things we had which you can never have. To you those relics of ours may seem to have been ridiculous, rather than precious, and to merit a grin, rather than a sigh, in their recounting. You may be right. But let your grin be kindly and fraught with much gentle tolerance. Let it be not derisive. This for your own sakes, not for ours. Because in another thirty years you will be trying, just as ineffectually, to act as Valedictorian to grinning 1958. If you desire tolerance for your own middle-age preachment, accord it to mine.

MAKING THINGS OVER

BY MITCHELL BRONK

THE city is being made over, and from a sky-scraping office window I am seeing it done. This city of Philadelphia has for a long time, in fact ever since "Mannahatta" passed her in the population steeplechase, been taunted in innumerable squibs with somnolence. Be that as it may, if she now slumbers, she snores, outrageously. Or she is waking up, and making a good deal of noise about it.

The Quakers should by all natural rights be Conservatives; but they are not; they never have been; they are worse than Conservative; or worse than Liberal, shall we say? They are Iconoclastic. George Fox and his compeers smashed many things that Seventeenth Century England revered. Nor are my fellow citizens of this Quaker City today at all regardful of the building that has gained a right to occupy its little piece of God's sunlit earth by the tenancy of many years. One sometimes even hears it intimated that we would not hesitate to sacrifice venerable and hallowed Independence Hall, if it were made worth our while to do so. Presumably that building is safe; because it is a paying proposition—from the tourist aspect! But little else is being spared. Up and down these tree-labeled thoroughfares by day and by night there is a great ado of tearing down and building up: destruction, construction, reconstruction; what you will. If Benjamin Franklin has any idea of ever paying his home town a Rip Van Winkle visit, he had better hurry up about it, or such visit will give him little satisfaction. But I set out to moralize.

We do this same thing in political and social ways; in letters; even in religion. Old forms of government, and *mores* that were built a hundred or ten hundred years ago, were all right, and are now sentimentally attractive, but we want something roomier and more convenient. The twenty-story building, Twentieth Century plumbing and heating, high speed elevators, for example,

will be more practicable; and is not pragmatism our philosophy? The Old World is finding that she has no time in this hurried generation to bother with the fuss of royalty; and we of the New are too crowded by the stress of all sorts of complicated domestic political and social problems and by our entanglements in foreign affairs to have room for the trappings of a very elaborate republic. Russia and China are doing it by revolution; the rest of us by evolution. We Americans have much to say about the stability of our governmental system and the rockbottom anchorage of our Constitution. But when we reflect, we have to confess to ourselves that there is a lot of shifting sand, *panta rei*, about it all. We suspect that if Washington, Jefferson and Hamilton could come back to life and observe things at the National Capital and walk about among the States, their eyes would open as wide as Franklin's would in a promenade today down Market or Chestnut Street.

There is the literary revolution, that they say is going on all over the world of letters. I am old-fashioned enough not to hold in contempt the old in literature. I must confess, indeed, that I do not any longer read the Victorians, and to a pharisaic feeling of sophisticated half disdain, half pity, when I find people doting upon this one or that of them: Scott, Dickens, George Eliot, Tennyson, Browning, or such back-number worthies of our own as Longfellow and Howells. Both these confessions, be it said, are proffered with no little shame. Theirs will never cease to be great names to me, so mightily did they impose themselves upon me in my boyhood. I can never get over it. Besides, both my head and my note books are full of them, and one is reluctant to throw out the window so much of the old furniture of his culture.

Nevertheless, I have a pronounced weakness for the innovators—for the *bahnbrecher*, as we used to say when it wasn't against the law to borrow German words and phrases—in both poetry and prose. My admiration for them knows no bounds. When I can't follow them the whole way—and some of them I can't—I stand back and applaud, and cry, "Go it!" Why isn't a literary mortmain as objectionable as any other kind? Why should the outstanding writers of one period selfishly hold the boards, or the

cards, on into the next, or dominate their posterity in literature? Let them step aside, I say,—or, more properly, move up to the top shelf, down to the stack room, out to the second-hand shop,—and give the other fellow a chance! That burning of the library at Alexandria by Caliph Omar wasn't such a bad thing after all; likewise those bibliographic bonfires that the state churches used to promote in the olden time! As for myself, I like a change; just as do the people who will move up from lower Chestnut Street and Independence Square into these new office buildings that I am watching rise. Emerson may speak as disparagingly as he will about the book that isn't a year old, but I like to stick my nose between pages that are odorous of fresh printer's ink and binder's paste, literally and figuratively. It was by doing this that I happened upon folks like Sandburg and Masters, Anderson and Lardner, and Mesdames Boissevain and De Selincourt, ever so long before what is termed "the reading public" did. My theory is, it will be seen, that if a writer manifests enough literary gumption to search out new forms of construction and presentation, a new technique, he may be depended upon to have something interesting to say and to say it interestingly.

There are, to be sure, the everlasting books; which, in the Scriptural phrase, "cannot be shaken". We never use such expressions as Victorian, Elizabethan, Cinquecento, Augustan, in speaking of them. For they are anyone's; not any period's; not any school's. You would scarcely compare them to a building along a city street; rather to one of the illustrious monumental structures of the world; say a pyramid of Egypt or one of its obelisks; or a Pæstum temple. Perhaps, indeed, a five-foot bookshelf would hold them; perhaps not. As for making out a list, the dignity of that word "classics" always frightens me from doing it.

A very wonderful place, as I remember it from my boyhood, was the attic of my grandfather's house. The old gentleman was decidedly thrifty and held on not only to his money, but to everything else. That attic was of course a place of general discard for disused utensils and garments. Attics are passing out of vogue. Modern houses aren't built with them. In the other sense we do not any longer have them; unless, indeed, you regard

as such our history books and encyclopedias. The World War made ours a destructive age. It was already iconoclastic; that is, destructive of gods, half-gods and temples. We called the Germans "Huns". We all are. Incidentally, we are beginning to sense Jesus's teaching: "Not in the *abundance* of the *things* that a man possesses does his life consist."

Formerly, when buildings were torn down, much of the stuff would be salvaged for the second-hand lumber yard. That isn't done any longer. It is too much trouble and not worth while. Into my office window blows the smoke of the bonfires where the destructable refuse material of these demolished buildings is being consumed. But—by way of exception—I notice that the more substantial refuse, the steel, stone, brick and cement, have their use and value, here or elsewhere, as filling and foundation. By the way, when you talk about the indestructibility of matter, you should really mean matter. Out of every breaking-up and conflagration of history there has been a large salvaging; not into attic store, but into new construction of our world's life. Nor is it at all likely to be otherwise with the wrecking in which we are participants. The Epistle to the Hebrews tells us that all these divine shakings-up are for the establishment of the things that are unshakable; and it was Emerson's philosophy that

What is excellent,
As God lives, is permanent.

You do not need to personify a city; it is already a person; in a spiritual sense. If Father Knickerbocker, and the typical Puritan of Boston statuary, and Carl Sandburg's Chicago Hog Butcher, and the William Penn atop our city hall, are not real to you, you do not know these cities. The Rome of Mussolini is the Rome of the Tarquins and Trajan. Paul Valéry is writing in the same Paris in which Pierre de Ronsard wrote. So all this tearing down and building up that I am witnessing will leave Philadelphia Philadelphia. There will be certain things about the town, certain characteristics, a certain atmosphere: perhaps its reputed staidness and sauntering gait; perhaps the indifference to civic abuses and lack of civic pride with which it is frequently charged; perhaps its large-hearted philanthropy, spelled out in its name; its spirit, in short—that will remain.

Have we any reason to expect that it is to be otherwise with the institutions and ideals that are important and dear to us, and about which we are just now so anxious and apprehensive because they seem to be a bit shaky and are getting such rough handling? One of our premises is that the spirit is what counts, the matter that really and superlatively matters. History has thus far never failed to repeat itself; confidence in God is, or should be, a part of man's integrity; and shall not this history and this faith give us the confidence that the spirit, the best, the really desirable, is going to abide?

And abide not only in a new, but in a better construction: A house of life that shall be pleasanter, more comfortable and commodious; at any rate better adapted to the modern man's life-housekeeping. The city in the Bible that came down out of Heaven was—notice—a new, not the old, Jerusalem; and according to the hectic description of the Book of Revelation it was a mighty fine place.

The waste and ruthlessness of it! That is what is troubling many of my contemporaries. Scarcely a day passes when I do not hear someone growling about the senselessness of demolishing one of these fine, solid, costly, comparatively modern structures—perhaps it is less than a dozen years old—to make way for another that shall be up-to-the-minute as well as up-to-date. This same thing is notoriously taking place along Broadway and Fifth Avenue and along the streets of other big cities. Besides, there is a vitality of charm and sentiment about some of these “obstacles to progress” that have to be removed, that renders the sight of their demolition painful; at least to the more sensitive. Shifting from Philadelphia to New York: The writer recalls how thirty years ago the residents of The Bronx were protesting against the chopping down of stately elms and kindly maples, and the leveling of picturesque little hills and dales, when that Borough was undergoing its transformation from a ruralness that we loved into urban ugliness.

Likewise, and more poignantly, it hurts that so many of the views, hypotheses, customs, styles and prejudices that are being torn down, dispelled, displaced, discarded, are not, as it seems to us, useless and worthless junk, and not at all old, but on the other

hand quite fresh, modern, usable, and having in them a good many years of life, as one would say. Well, you can't have a better or a best if the old cumbers the ground where it must stand. The "first heaven" and the "first earth" must pass away before the "new heaven" and the "new earth" may appear. Or, to switch to the surgical figure, painful operations are very commonly imperative for healthier bodily conditions, if not for the very saving of the life. I would rather believe that our world was going to the devil before 1914 than that it is now. Also, I would rather live in Philadelphia than in Carcassonne.

Accordingly, and manifestly this is the main point of my whole story, we are to be confident and optimistic, and not oppressed with gloomy forebodings, in the face of all these smashings of idols, shredding of patterns, and removing of landmarks that are going on around us. The construction gang follows the wrecking crew. These greedy property owners, and lessees, and realtors, mean well. They are forward-faced; that is all—for themselves first, but also for Philadelphia. They are not leaving their city lots vacant, to be targets for the Single Taxers. They put something in place of that which they take away. And when it is a better something, certainly no harm will have been done. In like manner, the Anarchists and Iconoclasts are not a bad lot, when you know what they are really at, and when they are also architects and prophets. We remember that Jesus cleared away whole neighborhoods of the well built up territory of antiquity's religious life, and that ours is an infinitely better world because He did it. For Jesus was constructive as well as destructive; splendidly He built up where unsparingly He tore down. If we of this disconcerted decade of this perplexing Twentieth Century will but follow His example, things will be all right.

AFFAIRS OF THE WORLD

EDITORIALLY REVIEWED

AMERICA NOT IN IT

“WE have won a great battle, brave Crillon,” said the King, “and you were not here!”

In the very central realm of the League of Nations there are many troubles, and threats of trouble. Italy and Albania have formed a hard and fast offensive and defensive alliance, quite in the old fashioned style, which is generally and plausibly interpreted as a measure of opposition if not of hostility to Jugoslavia and a step toward making the Adriatic Sea an Italian lake; at which France takes serious umbrage. Poland has been on the verge of war with Lithuania, though happily good relations have been restored through the good offices of the League, for which that body is entitled to much credit. Soviet Russia has been contemplating invasion of Poland. Roumania is in the throes of domestic dissension, threatening revolution. Germany regards Dantzic under Polish ownership much as France regarded Alsace in German hands, and cherishes a determination to redeem it with “blood and iron.” Great Britain is spending on defense \$200,000,000 a year more than before the World War. And jealousy, suspicion, resentment, covetousness and all other unholy passions are rife among the nations.

“We are having a parlous time, America,” says the League of Nations, “and you are not here!”

No, we are not; and we are glad of it. And in saying that we are not repeating the demand, “Am I my brother’s keeper?” Great as is our aversion to American complicity in European affairs, we have no wish to shirk responsibility or duty. If we were in any degree concerned in these complications, we should not demur to taking part in them. If our membership in the League of Nations would save Europe from such troubles and assure lasting peace and harmony, we should readily assent to

America's joining it. But the fact is that America has no more business to say whether Vilna belongs to Lithuania or Poland, or whether Poland should possess a corridor to the sea at Dantzic and thus cut Prussia in twain, than Switzerland would have to dictate the mode of partition of the Great Lakes between America and Canada. And nobody in his senses imagines that American membership in the League of Nations would prevent such troubles as are now vexing Europe. They would occur just the same, and the only difference would be that there would be one more Power dragged into the hell-broth, and no great and impartial Power left out of it to be perchance a mediator and the bearer of succor to the stricken. It would do nobody any good, and it would do us and others immeasurable harm. Not in selfishness, therefore, but in the truest spirit of altruism, we are glad that America is out of it.

ABOUT THOSE "CHINESE WALLS"

Canada purchases more goods from America than does any other country in the world, and—which is especially to the present point—has a much larger trade with us than with all the British Empire.

South America, as we have recently observed, purchases more from this country than from any three European countries united.

And that leads us to wonder about the location and the effectiveness of those "Chinese walls" of the tariff, concerning which we have heard so fearsome and harrowing tales, as barring our freedom of trade with the rest of the world. Certainly there is no trace of them along either our northern or our southern border.

THE CULT OF THE BEAUTIFUL

Commend to us the words of wisdom which the Commissioner of Education of the State of Maine recently broadcast by radio to the schoolteachers under his jurisdiction; when he said: "No one wants a teacher who looks shabby and run down at the heel. I want my teacher to be up to date. I want her to be as good looking as she can make herself. She will have a greater influence on the school if she is." It is time for the world to realize the

value of beauty as an asset, in education, in society, in ethics. For there is a certain relationship among the three manifestations of beauty; physical, mental and spiritual. Doubtless, of the three the first is the least important and the hardest to get and to keep, and the last is the most important and the easiest to acquire and to maintain. Yet all three are to be striven for, to the utmost degree, and the teacher who neglects any one of them fails in her duty as an exemplar. It was not for nothing that the Greeks so greatly exalted beauty in material things. It is not without significance that our current exploitation of the unbeautiful, in art and fashion and literature, is accompanied by an unprecedented prevalence of moral perversion and obliquity. It will be well if the State of "way down East" fulfils its ancient motto in leading us back to the Cult of the Beautiful.

POLITICS OR LEGISLATION?

"Seventieth Congress Opens with Every Eye Fixed on Next Year's Battle." That was a headline in a leading newspaper, and the same idea was expressed by almost every paper in the land. Moreover, and worst of all, it was probably true. But is that what Senators and Representatives are elected for? We find no prescription of it in the Constitution. Our idea was that the people elect Congress to make laws, and party conventions to make political nominations and plan campaigns.

BATTLING WITH BRAIN OR BRAWN

There is nothing extraordinary in the suggestion of cultural as well as athletic contests among universities and colleges. It is not even novel. Half a century ago there were yearly contests in oratory, and in late years there have been increasingly numerous and frequent debates among such institutions. That these have not attracted the attention and received the encouragement that football and other games have enjoyed is not the fault of the colleges but of the public, and the press. A newspaper will give ten columns to a football game or a regatta, and ten sticks, not to say lines, to a debate between the same institutions. The public will

flock by tens of thousands to the former, and be reluctantly dragged by tens or by hundreds to the latter. And the mordant irony of it is that those who throng the stadium and shun the lyceum are the self same public that vents sarcastic censure upon the colleges for giving—as it incorrectly declares—more thought to brawn than to brain.

PROPAGANDA WITH FALSE DATES

A correspondent of *The London Morning Post*, railing against America on account of the repudiated debts of some of the States, makes this astounding statement:

The real quarrel we have is that whereas when the money was borrowed the individual States could be sued in the Federal Courts of the U. S. A., an amendment has, since those debts were incurred, been passed in the Constitution of the U. S. A., preventing any State being sued.

It would be difficult to invent or to conceive a statement more at variance with the facts. The earliest of the repudiated debts was incurred in 1831 and was defaulted upon about ten years later. The Amendment to the Constitution to which the writer in *The Morning Post* refers, was ratified in 1798; a third of a century before any of the debts in question were incurred.

AMERICA'S PEACE TREATIES

Some thousands of estimable citizens have petitioned the President to make treaties with foreign Powers pledging both parties to perpetual peace and adopting arbitration as a substitute for war. Their motive is excellent, their purpose praiseworthy. But we must dismiss their fond conceit that this is a proposal of something new. So far as arbitration is concerned, America has stood for that from the very foundation of the Government. Even before the Constitution was adopted, Franklin advocated "a plan that would induce and oblige nations to settle their disputes without first cutting one another's throats;" and the first two treaties made under the Constitution expressly prescribed arbitration for the settlement of controversies even so serious as those involving title and sovereignty over territory. In the first century of our national life America was a party to between fifty

and sixty acts of international arbitration, or nearly half of all in the world. As for treaties pledging both parties to lasting peace and therefore by implication outlawing war, we have already made fifty-five of them, with forty individual Powers. Of these, twelve made peace "perfect, firm and inviolable"; eleven, "firm, inviolable and universal"; ten, "perpetual"; four, "firm and inviolable"; three, "firm and perpetual"; two, "firm and universal"; and one each, "firm and sincere," "firm, perpetual, inviolable and universal," "firm, inviolable and perpetual," "perfect and perpetual," "perpetual and constant," "forever, without war," "to subsist forever," and "trusting in God it will prove permanent"; and one declared "a sincere and constant good understanding." If all these solemn covenants were not sufficient to commit us to a policy of peace and outlawry of war, what more could do so?

Some of these treaties were broken, however, and war occurred; after which new ones were made, sometimes in the same terms as the old, sometimes in stronger and sometimes in less emphatic terms. Thus our treaty of "firm and sincere" peace with Algeria was broken by war, after which one was made providing for peace that should be "firm, perpetual, inviolable and universal." There was an undeclared but actual war with France in the twenty-two years interval between two treaties which alike established "firm, inviolable and universal peace." In 1794 we made with Great Britain a treaty of "firm, inviolable and universal peace"; broke it with our own declaration of war in 1812; and in 1814 replaced it with one of merely "firm and universal" peace; so that while a peace that was to be inviolable lasted only eighteen years, one that is not inviolable has already lasted a hundred and fourteen years and looks good for a still longer period yet to come. Precisely the same was done in the case of Mexico. Our treaty of "firm, inviolable and universal peace" was broken by war, and replaced with peace that was to be firm and universal but not necessarily inviolable. Perhaps the facts that two "inviolable" treaties had been violated disinclined our diplomats toward further use of that ineffectual word. With Spain we made "firm and inviolable" peace which lasted seventy-nine years and then was broken by war. Curiously enough the so-

called treaty of peace which ended that war made no mention whatever of peace; but a few years later we made another which precisely renewed the former pledge. Finally, with Tripoli we pledged "firm and perpetual" peace, broke it with a war, and then made a new peace which was to be inviolable as well as firm and perpetual.

What treaty we could now make which would be more binding than any of these former fifty-five, does not clearly appear; though perhaps we might try a composite of them all, pledging ourselves and our neighbors to a peace that should be constant, firm, inviolable, perfect, perpetual, sincere and universal, to subsist forever without war, trusting in God that it would prove permanent.

MONEY IN POLITICS

Senator Newberry incurred so much odium through the expenditure of about \$200,000 in his primary election campaign that he was compelled to resign his seat. Senator Smith is excluded from his seat, because he permitted the expenditure of \$250,000. On the other hand the Anti-Saloon League proclaims its purpose to spend a million dollars a year for the next five years in political propaganda, and claims exemption from the laws—which are binding upon all other political organizations—requiring statements to be filed of the sources of such funds and of the purposes to which they were applied. The "blind pool" of unlimited depth as a factor in National and State politics is scarcely to be regarded with complacency.

BRITAIN A GYNÆCOCRACY?

The question might almost be asked whether Great Britain is about to become, first of all important countries of the world, a gynæcocracy. Certain it seems to be that it is on the verge of one of the most momentous acts in its political history, in the adoption of its greatest extension of the electoral franchise. The famous Reform Act of 1832, which was considered to be quite revolutionary, enfranchised only 200,000 men. That of 1867 added a million to the polling lists. In 1884 under the cry of

“Manhood suffrage; one man, one vote!” 1,700,000 new electors were enrolled. In 1918 came the Act for the Representation of the People, which gave the Parliamentary franchise to about three million men and women. But now, ten years later, Parliament is expected to make the qualifications of women voters the same as those of men, in age and all other respects; and this will give votes to no fewer than 5,240,000 women who at present do not possess that right. On the basis of the latest registration this will give the women voters of the kingdom a majority of more than two millions over the men; the figures being 14,832,922 against only 12,697,799. Obviously, then, the control of the Government will be in the possession of the women, if they see fit to exercise it. That they will all act together as a political party, in opposition to the men, is too fantastically improbable to be worthy of consideration; though that they will exert a far greater influence upon politics than hitherto, and that it will be generally beneficent, may be regarded as morally certain.

COLLEGE MEN NOT DRONES

The too common reproach that colleges and universities are institutions maintained by endowments, in which rich men's sons lead lives of idleness, must be relegated to the dust bin, at least as far as some of the foremost seats of learning are concerned. The budget of one of the largest American universities shows that about eighty per cent. of its operating expenses are paid by the students themselves, through their tuition fees; while another survey shows that a large percentage of the students are earning part or all of their expenses. In another leading institution of the highest rank, of a graduating class of 124 all but eighteen had “worked their way” entirely or in part during their four years' course. This linking of work with study, like the correlating of the colleges with industry and commerce, is steadily increasing and bids fair to become one of the outstanding features of American academic life.

PUBLIC SOCIAL SERVICE

Much comment is made in Great Britain upon the enormous increase in treasury expenditures for various forms of public

social service. These include health and unemployment insurance, old age, war and widows' and orphans' pensions, housing, poor relief, education, and the like; and their total cost has increased in fifteen years about 458 per cent., or from \$276,300,000 to \$1,540,000,000 a year. Perhaps the most ominous feature of the case is the political influence which is exerted by the beneficiaries of these services and their friends, which is able to prevent any reduction but rather to compel persistent extension of the system. It must be recognized as constituting one of Great Britain's most serious social and economic problems, and it is not without its pertinence for American consideration. There have in recent years been numerous strong and not always unsuccessful efforts to commit this country to the same policy; which have gone so far as to raise pretty acutely the question whether the American ideal is to be a nation of semi-pauperized pensioners upon the bounty of the State, or a nation of independent, self-supporting citizens.

THE TRIBUTE OF SILENCE

We trust that the whole public appreciated justly the significance of the two minutes of silence on Armistice Day. When that practice was first prescribed it was generally, we fear, regarded as a temporary thing. It would be observed that year, of course, and perhaps for the next, and the next. But thereafter it would certainly fall into disuse and be forgotten. In fact, however, it seems to have been growing in universality, in spontaneity and in reverence year by year; until last November its observance everywhere, indoors and out, in city and country, was almost indescribably impressive. We venture to believe that the paying of that tribute of silence is becoming so fixed a habit with the American people that it will hereafter be as much a matter of course as is the small boy's passion for firecrackers on the Fourth of July.

BREAKING ANOTHER RECORD

Our old friend *Ben Trovato* used to tell of a preacher who announced for the text of a sermon against some extravagances of feminine fashions "the words of the Prophet, 'Top knot, come

down!" and when challenged as to its authenticity pointed triumphantly to the passage, "Let him that is upon the housetop not come down." We had thought that this marked the record for supreme achievement in that line of ingenious perversion; but we had reckoned without Chicago. In the conflict over American history books now raging in that city one of the works was publicly condemned because, it was said, it described Washington as a tyrant, dictator, despot, and "stepfather of his country", and added that "the Boston Tea Party was the last straw; the Colonies added insult to injury." This was indeed pretty bad, and seemed to stamp such books as unworthy of use in the schools. Examination, however, shows that while the words quoted are indeed in the books, they are merely cited as "horrible examples". Thus the author says: "*In King George's eyes* the Boston Tea Party was the last straw; the Colonies had added insult to injury;" and in another place, recalling the infamous campaign of Duane and others against the first President: "The press on both sides became coarse and abusive. Washington was reviled in language fit to characterize a Nero. 'Tyrant', 'dictator' and 'despot' were some of the epithets hurled at him. He was called the 'stepfather of his country'." By means of such wanton and malignant falsification it is sought to discredit men of high character and beneficent attainments and to garble and pervert the instruction of hundreds of thousands of children; and all to promote the peanut politics of a parochial boss!

"ADAM-BAD"

Into the international conference on reduction of armament swaggered Soviet Russia, the most aggressively and menacingly militaristic Power in the world, and with tongue in cheek expressed contempt for all that was being undertaken by proposing the disbandment of all armies, the scrapping of all warships, and the razing of all fortresses; a programme as perilous to the welfare of the world as any continuation of warlike preparations. Happily, the insolent marplotry had the good effect of solidifying the sentiment of civilized Governments against that troubler of the world, and to emphasize in all minds the prudent admonition,

Make ye no truce with Adam-bad,
The Bear that walks like a Man.

THE CRACKER BARREL PHILOSOPHER

BY BURGESS JOHNSON

"It's a fine day, isn't it?" I said to the Deacon. I found him outside in the afternoon sunshine repairing a bit of trellis from which the weight of a winter-sleeping rose vine hung. "Fine day, isn't it?" I repeated, as he kept to his task.

The Deacon turned and peered at me from under his bushy brows. "Do you want I should answer ye?" he inquired sharply. It was when in his sharpest mood that he reverted to the colloquial phrase and accent of his people.

"Why, yes, I suppose so," I grinned at him, uncertainly.

"Yes it is," said the Deacon. Then he smiled a welcome and put out his hand. "Come on indoors," he added. "It's winter, if it *is* fine."

The old lady was in her rocker in the sitting room and she nodded pleasantly. "He says it's a fine day, Ma. 'Tis, ain't it?"

"Yes," she nodded, "it's a fine day."

The Deacon wagged his head contentedly. "You belong to the same lodge," he remarked. "If Ma and I come down together in the morning and it's raining cats and dogs outside, and she happens to say 'It's rainin' hard, isn't it?' she'll keep on sayin' it till I say 'Yes, it's rainin' hard,' or words to the same effect. She knows I know enough to know it's rainin', but she wants I should join her in the remark. She's a natural born Joiner; that's one way to tell 'em."

The good lady continued with her sewing, quite undisturbed.

"She likes a sympathetic understanding," I offered lamely.

"Pooh!" said the Deacon; "she knows all about my sympathy after forty years. She wants outward expressions. I've known her to holler five times into the ear of deaf old Melissa Hicks, comin' home from church, that it was hot in the sun, till she got Melissa to agree that it was hot, an' both of 'em sweatin' fit to drown. No, there's just two kinds of people, taking 'em in the

aggregate," said the Deacon, puffing complacently; "the folks that like to feel that they belong, and those that don't care."

"Belong to what?" I asked.

"Oh, just any subdivision of the human race,—Daughters of Zion, Rotary, Christian Endeavor, or the Democratic party,—it don't make a great difference. Some like to join 'em all. It's just a question of the intensity of their joining instinct."

"And the other ones who don't join? Are they misanthropes, or cynical, or what?"

"Oh I wouldn't call 'em names," said the Deacon. "My classification don't line up with the virtues and vices; it cuts across 'em. The Joiners aren't all naturally affectionate, and the non-Joiners aren't misers and such-all. No, it's an instinct."

"Take the youngsters," said the Deacon, warming up to his subject. "One little kid comes home from school and says the boys are all wearing spotted shirts with big collars, and he won't go back to school unless he can have a spotted shirt. And another little boy in the same family maybe don't care a darn. The first one has got to prove that he belongs. When he grows up he's the fellow that likes to wear a pin and give a grip and a high-sign and sing something in unison. And he's the fellow that forces you to agree with him that its rainin' hard, when any fool knows it is."

"Meaning me?" I asked.

"Well," the Deacon grinned, "I'll bet if you don't belong to a lot of things it's only because you haven't got the time and the money."

* * * * *

"You don't approve of Joiners?" I suggested.

"On the contrary, civilization couldn't get on without 'em. They consolidate its gains, as the military men say. It's the Individualists who explore, and then along come the Joiners and hold the fort, all clasping hands and singing harmoniously. Of course I believe in 'em. Without 'em we'd slip back into chaos."

I was unconvinced. "Deacon," I said, "you're holding out on me. Mrs. Stebbins," I appealed, "why doesn't the Deacon belong to the Sons of the Revolution?" She looked up brightly.

"Ask him," she said. "I belong to the Daughters."

"Of course she does," the Deacon nodded. "I told you she's a natural born Joiner. Oh, well," he added after a pause, "I like to hear folks singing in unison—I kinda like to join in. But I'm damned if I'll *think* in unison!"

"Ab!" protested his wife. "You promised you wouldn't."

"I'm sorry, Ma." He winked at me. "She don't like I should swear; it's the wrong pass-word to our club. And she thinks it's the right one to a society I oughtn't to join."

Hastily I brought the subject back to its beginnings. "People have got to do some thinking in unison," I said, "if we are to be governed by majorities."

"You bet," said the Deacon cordially. "We've got to have parties and such. They hold the fort. Used to be a Republican myself, till Ma enrolled. Then I became a Democrat just to preserve the art of thinkin' in the family."

"He isn't anything," spoke up Mrs. Stebbins, with unwonted emphasis.

"Why, Ma! She wanted I should join the Grange. Said I made myself unsocial by staying out. That's one of those new words, and it's a mean one. Unsociable is nothin' to it."

"Why don't you join?"

"Well," said the Deacon, settling back comfortably. "I s'pose I've got sort of sot in my unsocial ways, though I certainly am fond of folks. But it looks to me like this: a lot of Joiners all think the same way about somethin' and they get real comfort out of knowin' they think together. Don't make any difference what it's about; it may be the nature of God, or whether cranberry pies ought to be made open-face, cross-bar or cover-top. So they form a society and they all chip in to hire an executive secretary to register their united sentiments. And the first thing he does is to print some letter-heads. Then they sigh contentedly an' stop thinkin'. But he has to keep right on. He's got to earn his salary and use his letter-heads. But sometimes," added the Deacon, "the executive secretary himself stops thinkin' or maybe he never knew how to think in the first place."

* * * * *

"The worst of the lot are the national organizations," reflected the Deacon over his pipe. "Any little local society ain't so bad."

The members can meet and argue. But then someone with the instincts of a professional organizer comes along and ties up all the local organizations into one big national one and gets himself elected national secretary and buys himself a lot of brand-new letter paper; and the fat is in the fire. He's got to go through the motions of earning his salary, and it's likely to be a big one, with all the dues coming in. His favorite way of doin' it is initiatin' legislation. He goes from Kankakee all the way to Washington, keepin' a conscientious expense account, and urges a bill that he drafted himself, and says that it has a million members behind it. And prob'ly it has, only they're too far behind. Half a million never heard of it because they don't bother to read the minutes of the national meetin' they didn't attend. And a lot of 'em wouldn't endorse it if they did their own thinkin' on the subject.

"I recollect," reminisced the Deacon, "that Ma here joined an anti-cruelty society and then woke up one day to find that she was anti-vivisection and anti-vaccination. And it wan't so long ago that I got persuaded to sign on the dotted line for a law enforcement society and then found that I was takin' a positive attitude on the rescinding of laws I might not like. Why, here in this paper is some foreign news about some sort of a New Health League in France. A lot of folks prob'ly joined it because they believed in new health; and I bet a lot of 'em were surprised to find that they had come out in favor of togas for men instead of pants. I bet Ma would forget her vocabulary if she saw me dressed in a sheet. . . . Yes siree, you hear a lot about military governments, and governments by the aristocracy and the proletariat, whoever they are; but I tell you we're facin' the danger of a government by executive secretaries."

* * * * *

"After all is said," I interposed; "the church is a national organization of local groups."

"And that's the worst thing about the church," answered the Deacon promptly. "The members all let their executive secretaries do their thinkin' and actin' for them, locally as well as nationally. Over here in Tompkinsville, for instance, there's all the proof you'd want. There used to be two strugglin' churches in town and some folks started to thinkin', and decided there

wa'n't any difference in their theological views any more, so they'd better unite and have one good church. So they voted to unite. But that let some executive secretaries out of jobs. I guess they were conscientious enough, but they didn't realize they were hurt in their pride and not in their theology. So in each church an executive secretary split off and took some folks along, and now there's three churches instead of two, and a whole lot more church letter-paper."

"I didn't know churches had executive secretaries," I objected.

"An executive secretary," said the Deacon, "is an attitude of mind. Sometimes it's in the parson, and sometimes in the head deacon. And often it's an earnest lady who doesn't have any official title. But she holds the job."

* * * * *

We have come upon new times, with new *mores*. Here is a letter, evidently from a lady, and a young one at that. Time was when the advent of such a one to the circle around the Cracker Barrel would have wrought revolution. But not now. She may sit in, and put her feet up; but we draw the line at any use of the saw-dust box. Women never could aim straight:

One remark of the Deacon's especially sticks in my mind: "The worst kind of vice a man can have is the one that he doesn't admit. . . because he's forgotten he's got it."

But my dear Deacon, isn't there more pathos than depravity in such a condition? "Forgotten he's got it"—the saddest words of tongue or typewriter! For though there be nothing sweeter than a new vice of which one is fully and deliciously conscious, there is nothing more dreary than one which has become so generally tolerated that it passes unnoticed by others as well as one's self. Habitual vices are about as gay and exciting as habitual surprise parties.

How well I remember the beautiful new vices which enlivened my youth and the utter flatness of them when they lost their freshness. In the first place, there was the pleasure of reading forbidden books, a deep and memorable joy. I had been placed on a strict diet of classics,—and Shakespeare, Thackeray and Scott, with Dickens as the lightest *hors-d'oeuvre*,—all of which I read conscientiously with even an occasional unwitting lapse into interest. But stolen fruit looked far more fair, and when I heard my very young friends refer to glamorous persons in the pages of vulgar literature, I grew almost mad with curiosity.

Finally I began to smuggle in bootleg books, hiding them with youthful irony behind the Shakespeare set and reading them after I was supposed to be

asleep. The doleful adventures of little Elsie Dinsmore, who could shed more tears per paragraph than any other heroine of literature; the flawless Little Colonel and her gallant boy friends who made love in pretty symbols—so different from the grinning hoodlums I knew; pretty Patty Fairfield who flirted continually yet somehow managed to remain a lady throughout interminable volumes. Then delicious dips into more adult slush; beautiful young women washed up on desert isles with beautiful young men—together with a waterproof chest containing every provision one could possibly desire.

Yes, it was glamorous stuff—but alas, not always to remain so. I went away to boarding school and my reading ceased to be supervised. Such books became an everyday matter and lost their charm. I even discovered a shocking impulse to revert to the classics.

And with the movies it was much the same story. At first, when they were in the nickelodeon stage and taboo, I found them irresistible. What joy to sneak in after school and sit enthralled through *The Adventures of Kathleen*, *The Perils of Pauline*, *The Loves of Listerine*, or what have you? To say nothing of the delights of the illustrated songs—*In the Shade of the Old Apple Tree* rendered by a lush soprano, or the cripple's jeremiad, *Mother, When I Go to Heaven, Will the Angels Let Me Play?* But now that attending the movies is a vice I've forgotten I have, it's not the same thing at all. I sit quite relaxed in my seat, and sometimes even go so far as to "look for the nearest exit."

Yet perhaps the worst of all was getting casual about smoking. Once I kept my cigarettes for very special occasions and was as careful about my settings as Morris Gest. Teatime at a New York hotel was best—when I would breathlessly take out my case and holder and proceed to my inalienable American rights—life, liberty and the pursuit of snappiness. I did it most effectively in black satin, I thought, and with my eyes half closed, gazing off into infinity. But inevitably, as smoking became more common, I came to take it more calmly. One day I went so far as to smoke in a sweater and skirt—and then in a baby blue organdie. I still dramatize myself a bit—"the sophisticated *mondaine* toying with her cigarette." But how can I do it whole-heartedly when any moment at the next table I may see a plump housewife lighting up?

No there's nothing so melancholy as a vice which has ceased to be vicious. From the depths of your wisdom, don't you agree with me, Deacon, that tolerance has spoiled a lot more fun than intolerance?

M. C. S.

Rock Island, Ill.

IN RETROSPECT

[IT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW TO REPRINT IN EACH NUMBER PERTINENT EXCERPTS FROM ITS ISSUES OF A CENTURY OR MORE AGO.—
The Editors.]

CALEB CUSHING, *the eminent diplomat and jurist, in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for April, 1828, told of the abolition of the ungallant Ducking Stool for common scolds in America:*

Our ungallant fathers of the common law provided a peculiar punishment for common scolds, but carefully confined the crime and the punishment to scolds of the female sex. Scolds are defined in the books to be "troublesome and angry women, who, by their brawling and wrangling amongst their neighbors, break the public peace, increase discord, and become a public nuisance to the neighborhood." . . . The scold was indictable as a common nuisance, and if convicted was sentenced to be placed on a certain engine of correction called a castigatory, trebucket, or cucking stool, and after being exposed thereon to be plunged in the water. . . . We are not aware that this relic of ancient coarseness has been recognised in this country, as adhering to any of the American codes; and a recent English writer speaks of the punishment as being antiquated and almost obsolete. A case lately decided in Pennsylvania may be considered as furnishing a safe precedent for all the other States in the Union. The Court of Quarter Sessions for the county of Philadelphia, in October, 1824, convicted Nancy James of being a common scold, and in obedience to several precedents in the same court, but none later than 1782, sentenced her to the cucking stool and to be three times plunged in the water. Upon writ of error, brought in the Supreme Court, this tribunal had sufficient manliness to resist the attempt to revive the barbarous usage, and pronounced that the punishment itself had no legal existence in Pennsylvania. (12 *Serg. & Rawle*, 220.) In Massachusetts it is settled that this mode of correction, as singular and ludicrous as it is cruel, is incompatible with a provision of the Constitution, which prohibits the infliction of all "cruel and unusual punishments."

That Congressional oratory a hundred years ago differed little from that of today is indicated by some remarks by WILLIAM TUDOR, Jr., in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for January, 1828:

Though to some we may appear to write with too much frankness, we apprehend that a majority of the nation will agree with us, and would be glad to have

the proposition established; that, speeches in Congress have increased, are increasing, and ought to be diminished. The House of Representatives are the natural, immediate guardians of the people,—but who are to guard the guardians? . . . The obvious remedy for the evil would be found by not publishing the speeches *in extenso*. Because, in most cases, it is not the effect of the speech in the House, that the debater thinks or cares about. His object is to get his speech into the newspaper, and besides its circulation in that shape, the printer, for a trifling fee, breaks up his endless columns into a dingy, pamphlet page; and these precious missives the member despatches to sundry of his constituents, who stare with pleasure at the efforts of their representative, and have their pride gratified in receiving a communication “free.” Were the postage demanded, most of them would be inhumed in the dead-letter office, and come back to that bourne, the general post office, whence they proceeded. If only the substance of the speech was given, the real arguments of the speaker stated, as there would be the three grains of wheat in the five bushels of chaff, a most salutary corrective would be applied, and the editor besides enabled to devote a large part of his paper to useful and entertaining miscellanies, and his readers would get a much clearer insight into public affairs.

That the “Agricultural Problem” is no new thing is attested by some remarks, quite pertinent to the present time, made by the Editor of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW in November, 1816, in commenting upon an address by DAVID HUMPHREYS, the poet, hero of Yorktown and friend of WASHINGTON, on the Agriculture of Connecticut:

If you ask a capitalist why he does not engage in agriculture, the universal reply is, “nothing can be got by farming.” Nor is this opinion confined to them; the owners of land generally throughout the country show by their practice that they entertain the same opinion. The wealthier inhabitants in the country cultivate a farm they have inherited, and slowly improve it. The fences in the country are better and more permanent than they were twenty years ago; the fields are many of them smoother, the orchards are perhaps more numerous. There are some few places where a man would not now cut down an oak for fire wood, to plant a poplar for ornament. These are changes for the better; but how many farmers in the country lay out their surplus income in the melioration of their estates, in cultivating beyond the supply of their own wants, for the market? Do they not prefer hazarding their money in commerce, in manufactures, in banking, none of which they can know much about? Who are the people who say that nothing can be made by farming?—A citizen of one of the towns, who buys a few acres of land at a high rate, erects an expensive house, costly fences, cultivates Indian corn and potatoes, feeds labourers without economy, whom he does not oversee, and finds that his corn has cost him three times what he can buy it for—or having heard that Merino

sheep produce fine wool, and fine wool commands a good price, buys a flock of sheep at a hundred dollars apiece, puts them under the care of the first man he can hire; and when dogs, diseases, and neglect have thinned his flock, finds that he has not got the golden fleece, and denounces Merino sheep. Yet this same individual would smile with pity at a man who should take an expensive ship, put a numerous crew on board, load her with staves, send her a long voyage, and then wonder that the portage bill devoured the freight.

The marked prevalence of Sun Spots at this time recalls the remarks of the famous mathematician JOHN FARRAR in commenting upon HERSCHEL'S theory of them, in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for May, 1816:

The sun's spots then, according to this hypothesis, are chasms in his atmosphere, occasioned by ascending currents of gaseous fuel, and they are succeeded by faculæ, as they are called, or bright spots, on account of this additional supply of combustible matter, which, it may be supposed, is most completely on fire soon after the opening has closed. But how is the sun ordinarily furnished when there are no spots? The gas may be more diffused, and by ascending in smaller quantities, may produce no sensible disturbance of the luminous fluid. Besides, there are probably openings, that are too small to be seen, and the sun may never be free from them. It is only when their absolute magnitude is very great, that they become an object of any attention.

The sentiments of the illustrious JOHN ADAMS on the subject of "universal and perpetual peace" were set forth by him with characteristic directness and vigor in a letter to the head of a Peace Society, printed in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for February, 1816:

I have read, almost all the days of my life, the solemn reasonings and pathetic declamations of Erasmus, of Fenelon, of St. Pierre, and many others against war, and in favour of peace. My understanding and my heart accorded with them, at first blush. But, alas! a longer and more extensive experience has convinced me that wars are as necessary and as inevitable, in our system, as Hurricanes, Earthquakes and Volcanoes. Our beloved country, sir, is surrounded by enemies, of the most dangerous, because the most powerful and most unprincipled character. Collisions of national interest, of commercial and manufacturing rivalries, are multiplying around us. Instead of discouraging a martial spirit, in my opinion, it ought to be excited. We have not enough of it to defend us by sea or land.

Universal and perpetual peace appears to me, no more nor less than everlasting passive obedience, and non-resistance. The human flock would soon be fleeced and butchered by one or a few.

I cannot therefore, sir, be a subscriber or a member of your society.

I do, sir, most humbly supplicate the theologians, the philosophers, and the politicians, to let me die in peace. I seek only repose.

Political discussions a century and more ago were subject to the same abuses that mark them today, according to the brilliant scholar and publicist EDWARD TYRREL CHANNING, in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for January, 1817:

Political discussion should be calm as well as practical. Our institutions and privileges are too costly, to be the prey or theme of stormy and troubled eloquence, such as kindled the old republics to madness, and led them to deal with the State and its glory as playthings for their passions. It is not now considered as an insult to the free, to tell them that they must respect deliberation, order, and settled habits; and be content to keep their sympathies and ambition at home, under the control of good sense and sound morals. Still there are dangers of false excitement and corrupt eloquence even now. Men have not yet got over their love of being moved, of coming to their duties with feverish preparation, rather than with calm and brave resolution. And if you want bad men to succeed, the best thing you can do for them is to form and cherish in the people a habit of excitement, of approaching their interests with heated minds, of looking upon truth as cold and spiritless, unless it is fairly on fire, or relieved and garnished by eloquence. Once get up this taste, in support of the honestest principles, and by and by you will find other teachers in your places, turning your weapons to most admirable uses, and lighting the torch of hell at your pure vestal flame of truth.

This sharp reply was given by the Editor of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW in May, 1816, to some animadversions upon America in a book by General TURREAU, formerly French Minister here:

The author asserts that life is quickly consumed in the United States, and that few individuals attain to old age, that he has walked for hours in the streets of Baltimore, Philadelphia and New-York, without meeting any aged persons; that the abandonment in our infant, and the profligacy of our youthful State, together with the train of horrible disorders almost unknown in Europe, are the cause of our perishing so prematurely. We might say in return, that we have walked for hours in France, without meeting any *young* men, which was probably owing to a horrible disorder that prevailed in that country, wholly unknown in this, called *conscription*.



Copyright Eugene L. Ray, Evanston, Ill.